

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 22, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.  
Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.  
The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar—pension bills—in order to-day, be in order to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal; that is, that to-morrow be substituted for to-day for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar—pension bills—shall be in order to-morrow in lieu of to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

## INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 26916) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian department, for fulfilling treaty relations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report (H. Rept. No. 1897), referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York reserves all points of order on the bill.

## NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 26394, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. MANN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending proposition is the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY], which, without objection, the Clerk will again report.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, line 7, after the word "constructed," strike out all down to and including line 12.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the committee for a moment. We have reached that portion of the bill relating to the increase of the navy, and the first paragraph provides for the construction of two first-class battle ships. I understand that there is a desire on the part of some Members for a little debate, and I am going to ask unanimous consent that we have debate upon this proposition for one hour; one half to be controlled by some gentleman in opposition to the recommendation of the committee and the other half to be controlled by the chairman of the committee, and that then we come to a vote upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to one hour, to be equally divided between those in favor of the paragraph and those opposed to the provision in the bill; one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois, and the other half by some gentleman in opposition thereto.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to ask this question: Whether or not there are not two classes of Members who are opposed to this provision in the bill, one those who want to strike out or reduce and another to increase?

Mr. FOSS. I think not. There are only those who are opposed and those who are in favor of the committee proposition, so far as I have been able to learn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it would not be possible to extend the time to two hours. I know myself of four or five gentlemen who wish to talk on this battle-ship proposition, and it will be impossible for them to be heard if only thirty minutes on a side would be permitted.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, we have a number of very important matters in this bill ahead, and it is my desire to get

through to-day, if it is possible; but if we increase the time, as the gentleman suggests, we will not be able to do it, and I think most of the Members have made up their minds upon this proposition, and I doubt very much whether general discussion would change the vote if it were taken at this time. I am very anxious that we should proceed, in view of the fact that there are other very important matters ahead—

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I object. I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for unanimous consent, as stated by the Chair, for one hour debate on this paragraph. Is there objection?

Mr. GRIGGS. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest an hour and a half to be equally divided—

Several MEMBERS. Make it two hours.

Mr. FOSS. Then, I do not think we can get through with the bill to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GRIGGS. I object.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the parliamentary situation of this matter. Suppose this request is not granted; will there not be debate on the proposition, and will not that continue until the committee directs it be closed?

The CHAIRMAN. If the request of the gentleman be not granted, of course debate will continue so long as it may under the rules of the House.

Mr. HEPBURN. I object, then.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection has already been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Unless a motion like the gentleman has made, or some similar motion, prevails, nobody can speak more than five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Nobody can speak more than five minutes, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me the sensible thing to do is to agree as to time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands there is objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes; lots of it.

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to extend the time of debate to two hours.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois amends his request and asks unanimous consent that debate upon the pending paragraph, and all amendments thereto, be limited to two hours, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois and the other half to be controlled by some one in opposition. Is there objection?

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the gentleman from South Carolina offered the amendment, and it seems to me that he should be allowed to control the time in favor of the amendment. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] offered the amendment.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] be allowed to control the time in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois incorporate in his request the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Georgia, that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY]?

Mr. FOSS. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the pending amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 59, line 7, after the word "constructed," strike out the remainder of the paragraph down to and including line 12.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the effect of that amendment? We can not judge.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from South Carolina is first entitled to recognition. I suggest that the gentleman who proposed the amendment is first entitled to recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, the gentleman from Illinois in charge of the bill is entitled to recognition.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the gentleman from South Carolina go ahead and explain his amendment.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a time in our history when preparations for war and further increases of armaments are both unwise and unnecessary, it is the present; unwise because the normal annual expenditures in the national household now exceed the revenues by considerably more than \$100,000,000, and unnecessary because we are not only at peace with all the world, but, what is more, we have wisely managed to safeguard our peace as it had never been safeguarded before. Hence every consideration of prudence and patriotism points to the present as the most propitious time to pause, temporarily at least, in our vast expenditures for so remote an eventuality as war.

We are all agreed that if our country were in any immediate danger of a foreign invasion or of war with a foreign foe no sacrifice would be too great for us to make for our defense. To raise money, we would issue bonds and, if needs be, mortgage our homes for that purpose; in fact, this mighty Nation, rising in its own defense, would be a spectacle of patriotic self-sacrifice such as the world has never witnessed before.

In such a crisis we would justly scorn financial considerations or even deficits in the Treasury, for in the face of national danger all other interests must be subordinated to the one paramount duty, the national defense. I will even go further, and say that if there were but a well-authenticated probability of any foreign complications preparations to obey the law of self-defense would still be in order. But at a time when there is no more probability of war than there is of lightning striking our houses at this season of the year—and I shall give my reasons for this assertion—at such a time, I claim, we have no moral right to run the Government into debt in order to pay for totally unnecessary increases of the implements of war. Before flattering national vanity by increasing the navy beyond the requirements of effective national defense I hold it to be our bounden duty to provide for the necessities of the peaceful development of the country and to subordinate the unreasonable demands of the jingo to the obligations which the Government owes to the peaceable citizen and taxpayer.

And as not one of us, Republican or Democrat, can furnish to his constituents a valid excuse for government expenditures in excess of government revenues, except in time of war, this duty becomes the more patent to all.

When I came to Congress sixteen years ago the navy cost us about \$22,000,000 annually. This year's budget calls for over one hundred and thirty-five millions. While in that same period of time the population has increased only about 35 per cent, naval expenditures have increased over 600 per cent. These figures show that we have already gone back on the traditions handed down to us by the founders of the Republic, which teach us to rely for national safety upon our inherent strength, our righteousness, and our sense of justice, and that instead we have accepted the false theory through which monarchs from time immemorial have filched money from the pockets of their people, namely, the theory that armaments and man-killing machineries alone can vouchsafe security and peace. Do not the figures I have just cited bear out this assertion? And have we not actually been told time and again that a big navy is the best guaranty of peace? It is false, I say again, and our own history proves it to be false. Why was it that we enjoyed both peace and immunity from attack when we had no navy at all? Does it not dawn upon those who are misled by that fallacy and who constantly shout for more arsenals and more battle ships that, after all, there might have been something besides the big stick that deterred either Europe or Asia from invading this Republic of free men? Was not safety rather to be found in our isolated position, our numbers, our limitless resources, our love of peace and justice, our stout hearts, and in the patriotism born of liberty? [Applause.]

But let us for an instant meet on common ground. Let us admit, for argument's sake, a powerful navy to be the only real guaranty of our security. How many battle ships would we have to build to be absolutely secure? Certainly more than any other one nation, and in fact more than all other nations combined; for if naval armaments are to be the only safeguard of a nation's peace, we would be in constant danger of being overawed, because our big stick is not as big as all the other big sticks combined. Is not this the true logic of the plea for a bigger navy? And if it is, then all those who believe in the peace-promoting mission of the fleet would be forced to the conclusion that true patriotism requires the immediate construction, not of two, but of at least a hundred, *Dreadnoughts*. The fact, however, that they are willing to content themselves with two amounts to an abandonment of their own theory and is a practical admission that our safety rests on a better, securer

foundation than mere iron clads, and one which our navy boomers quite evidently rely on themselves. From their view point two additional ships can not possibly afford adequate protection; and if, nevertheless, they are satisfied with this increase, we have a right to conclude that it makes no difference whether we build two more ships or none at all. Either course would be inconsistent with and contrary to the theory that the peace and tranquillity of the United States depends upon battle ships alone. If we are not to be entirely burglar proof until our navy equals that of Great Britain, or, in fact, the navies of all nations combined—and that is and must be the contention of our friends, the navy boomers—then it is immaterial whether we have two iron clads more or less at this time, because we are insecure in any event.

There is but one consistent course to be taken in this emergency. It is to refuse all unreasonable demands for additional armaments. Such a course will be consistent, in the first place, with American traditions; it will also be consistent with the enlightened sentiment of the world, and it will be consistent with our own professions, as well as with the actual situation.

The sentiment of the people everywhere is for peace and not for war, and that sentiment is stronger than you and I realize. The governments, too, seem willing at last to heed the voice of the people. As proof I point to The Hague conferences, the pan-American conferences, the many arbitration treaties, to the official recognition willingly accorded by the governments to the Interparliamentary Union, that world organization of lawmakers which aims to substitute arbitration and judicial decisions for war, and last, but not least, to the fact that, in spite of the recent political upheavals in the Balkans, peace has been maintained. There was a time, and it was true up to a few years ago, that you could not strike a match in the European Orient without causing a terrific explosion, and what has happened there recently? Turkey has had a bloodless revolution, resulting in a new era of constitutional government; Austria quietly annexed the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina; and the Servians declared their political independence; and all this without the shedding of a drop of human blood, when, ten years ago, either one of these events would have been sure to cause a world conflagration. What is it? Say what you please, but in my judgment it is the progressive thought and enlightenment of the people, the growing sentiment in favor of enduring peace, and the fear of the great military powers, because of that sentiment, to put their war machinery in motion. It seems almost as if in the incredibly short period of ten years a transition had taken place, as if the world had suddenly emerged, in this respect at least, from a state of semi-barbarism and risen to a higher civilization, in the light of which rulers are either afraid or ashamed to draw the sword and prefer to keep the peace by resorting to arbitration or appealing to the courts established by international agreements. Certain it is that a new era has dawned and that the increased armaments which followed the First Hague Conference, and to which my friend from Illinois [Mr. Foss] so frequently refers, merely mark the last flickering up of the halo of the old system, a system, however, which is doomed to oblivion, doomed to give way to that new order of things which will recognize a legalized machinery of justice, instead of brute force, as the only legitimate means of settling international controversies.

Look at the wonderful change wrought within the last few years in our own country and its relations with the outside world. Thanks to the wisdom and energy of Secretary Root, we have concluded arbitration treaties with about 20 countries of America, Europe, and Asia. We have been relieved as a result of the Second Hague Conference of our real or fancied responsibilities with regard to the debts of the Latin-American countries, inasmuch as it was agreed at The Hague, all powers consenting, that contractual debts shall no longer be collectible by force. More than that, we have an understanding with Japan which, in my judgment, will go down into history as one of the greatest achievements of the present administration. In the course of the remarks I submitted on the battle-ship question at the last session I used this language:

Unless we are all in ignorance as to the true situation—and it is incredible that the Mikado's diplomatic representatives should misrepresent it to us—a simple agreement to arbitrate differences and to mutually guarantee territorial integrity and undisputed home sovereignty would effectually dispose of the Japanese question for all time to come, and not a single battle ship will be needed to secure the benefits of such a treaty.

While our understanding with Japan—or call it agreement or declaration of principles, or anything else—does not go quite as far as I then indicated, it surely carries with it the guaranties of amity and good will, and forms the basis upon which peace between the two nations can be maintained. The situation regarding the Philippines has also been cleared. The fact

of this outside possession of the United States has constantly been used as an argument for a bigger navy; but it is now clear that neither a European power nor Japan wants these islands, and our understanding with the Government of the Mikado covers this very point. From this brief review of the situation it appears that war involving this country is a much more remote possibility to-day than it ever was before.

Now, as to the latest scare about a possible war with Japan. Does it not strike the Members of this House as a most peculiar coincidence that every time we consider the naval appropriation bill there suddenly appears the handwriting on the wall picturing a war? Is it merely an accident that on the very day when we were expected to vote on battle ships the morning papers reproduce, with glaring headlines and in double-headed type, the opinion of a New York editor, whose views otherwise they so frequently discredit and whose California interests are too well known to need any comment here? The President of the United States has, with praiseworthy foresight, repudiated in advance and on behalf of the Nation whatever action the California legislature may take with respect to the so-called "Japanese bills." Hence Japan can not, and I am sure will not, hold the American Nation responsible for whatever the legislature of a single State may do, no more than the British Government would hold us responsible for resolutions of mass meetings of Irish-American citizens denouncing England. The trouble between California and Japan can never be settled by war, because war never settles a question of right or wrong. It must be a question of the deepest concern to us, however, to find some way by which the supremacy of the Nation and its foreign policies can be maintained as against the rights of individual States. In other words, national obligations must be made as binding upon each state government as they are upon the National Government, and as sacred in their observance as the provisions of the Constitution itself. It is therefore really an American question, and one to be adjudicated by ourselves; and this being well understood all over the world, no sane nation will go to the length of declaring war upon us on account of it. Some of them may refuse to negotiate arbitration treaties with us because of the sovereign rights of the separate States, but they will no more dream of drawing the sword because of petty grievances arising from this situation than they would ever interfere with our international affairs. If a single State could coerce the National Government to make a state question a concern of the Government and to defend the action of a State, right or wrong, the case would, of course, be different; but in the determination of so grave a question as war, all governments are guided and controlled by the attitude of the responsible government and not by that of its press and its component parts.

And as long as Japan is satisfied as to the correct and friendly attitude of the Government at Washington, no amount of jingo talk by the press or individuals will ever drive her into a bloody conflict with the United States. It is even unnecessary to call attention to the fact that our naval strength is double that of Japan to-day.

Mr. Chairman, on the pending question I shall vote in accordance with my conscientious convictions, and shall refuse to be influenced by either fear or intimidation. [Applause.]

[During the delivery of the above remarks the time of Mr. BARTHOLDT expired.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Can I have five minutes more?

Mr. FINLEY. I am afraid I will not be able to yield the gentleman any more, as all the time has been allotted.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FINLEY. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to consume some of his time now.

Mr. FOSS. I will ask if any gentleman on this side desires to occupy any time in support of the provision in the bill? No one seems to desire to be heard in favor of the proposition, so I will suggest to the gentleman from South Carolina that he go ahead.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he intends to use all the time in one speech; if not, the other side should occupy some of its time now.

Mr. FOSS. I do not think we will consume all of our time. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if there is anyone who desires to speak in favor of the two battle ships on this side?

Mr. WALDO. A little later on I would like to have a few minutes, but not at the present.

Mr. FOSS. No one on this side now seems to desire to speak at this time.

Mr. TAWNEY. I submit that in order that this debate may proceed in an orderly way that the gentleman should consume some of his time.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like the gentleman from Illinois to repeat his statement.

Mr. FOSS. I will now yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALDO. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the purpose of this amendment, it is to end the present policy of the United States of keeping a navy that will permit us to rank with the great naval powers of the world. It is a policy that we started upon quite a good many years ago; it is a policy that permitted us to succeed in the war with Spain; it is the policy to-day that makes the United States respected and its citizens sure of protection in all parts of this world. It seems to me that at this time, when we are hardly fairly started upon our programme to have a navy equal to any nation, that we should not call a halt. It is very pleasant to talk about peace and prosperity, but in this world no nation has peace or prosperity that is not able to defend itself.

The moment that we cease our naval programme our navy is on the way to decay. Naval ships only last a few years, and still fewer years do they remain equal to the naval improvements of other great powers. If we desire to protect our country; if we desire that our citizens be protected abroad; if we desire that our country shall continue to be respected as one of the great powers, we must continue our naval programme; we should vote against this amendment and see that at least two battle ships are ordered at this session of Congress.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire if there is any other gentleman who desires to speak now in favor of the two battle ships? If not, I suggest that my friend go ahead on the other side.

Mr. FINLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to strike from this measure the pretense that a nation is prepared for war in order to preserve peace; the mask that, consciously or unconsciously, hides the real spirit of warlike ambition; the pretense that has prevailed among men from time immemorial.

It was the pretense under which the nations of the East, before the time of Alexander, invaded the nations of the West. It was done, they said, to check the growing spirit of aggression in the West. It was the pretense under which Alexander invaded Asia. He wished, he said, to forestall all future invasions by the Asiatics. It was the pretense under which the fortified castles of the middle ages were erected, the barons armed against each other, and perpetual warfare was carried on. This condition grew so fearful that men almost forgot the peaceful avocations of life, while each nobleman increased the thickness of his castle wall, the weight of his cannon or battering-ram, and the number and strength of his armor retainers, until the church, to prevent all peace from taking its flight from among the peoples who professed to be the followers of the tender gospel of Christ, proclaimed, as I remember it, "The truce of God," in order that there might be one day in the week in which the owners of castles might rest and remain safely at home and the armored knights should not engage in foraging expeditions against their neighbors. Lords built castles, barons and knights buckled on armor, armies were marshaled, and nations bathed in blood and fire in the name of peace.

The war of the Dutch Republic, when the Spanish soldiery invaded the country, was waged by the invaders in the name of the Prince of Peace; so also were all the crusades, which extended over a period of three hundred years and were marked by a spirit of bloodthirstiness never surpassed, launched in the love of God and righteousness, and the children's crusade, the crowning cruelty of all the ages, was the joint product of human ambition and the preaching of righteousness and peace.

We saw that also in modern times in our communities, when it was thought that every citizen should have the right to carry a pistol about his person, and in my State the horseman carried it hung to the horn of his saddle, and the footman carried it swung around his waist, and no man was expected to go about unarmed until the law said that we should disarm all citizens, and peace substantially followed. I want to say that since the time when Constantine the Great, at the head of his army, claimed that he saw the shadow and the sign of the cross in the sky, these claims have been false pretenses, and we should strike the mask from the pretense under which we arm for war while we claim we arm for peace. [Applause.]

Not only that, but all these military preparations have hung themselves like millstones around the industries of the people. In the day of small production the lord carried his feudal sub-

jects with him to the field, while the women worked at home to produce the meager necessities to support life. How they lived at all in those days and supported such vast armies God only knows, but we do know that they lived hard, with half the bare necessities of healthy life supplied and in virtual slavery. And we do know that a Louis XIV in France so multiplied the burdens of his people in order, as he claimed, by the greatness of his power, to make that power feared and to deter the other nations from attacking him or thwarting his plans, that while he filled his land with martial pageantry and wrote glory large for more than a half century of his reign, he wrote shame at the end of it, and for his successors sowed the seeds of a revolution that shook all the nations of the earth. In this advanced age, when production has increased to such an extent that one-fifth of our population might support the balance, with improved machinery, we must devise some means by which we can hang this millstone of war expenditure around our people's neck again, and we devise great battle ships, under which, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] has said, we are spending to-day \$135,000,000 for a navy, whereas when he came into the House sixteen years ago \$20,000,000 was sufficient.

The time will soon come, if the rush of progressive increase is continued, when \$250,000,000 will be required annually to keep up this increasingly heavy and heavier burden of the navy. Our Government ought to keep abreast of the times, ought to be continually building some vessels, in order that we may keep posted as to the latest improvements in naval warfare; but we have 6 underway now, and in ten years' time the repairs and changes on the vessels we have in the navy will cost more than it costs to build 4 ships a year to-day. If we could have another Roosevelt, and Congress should accede to his requests, at the end of another eight years' term we would perhaps be spending \$400,000,000 per annum on the navy alone. If our navy as we have it were placed upon the Pacific Ocean, the only cloud in the sky of peace would be successfully dissipated. In my opinion, the European nations contemplate war only with horror, because they are advanced and civilized, and have not the thirst of blood. Possibly the Japanese nation to-day, in its youthful resurrection from a long sleep of inaction, would lose their balance and plunge into war, though I do not believe it. If that be the case, we are prepared against them without further expenditure, for we have a greater navy than they have themselves.

We must not forget that the building of a navy never ends. It takes three to four years to build a battle ship, and it is not completed before repairs and changes begin. In about ten years it is likely to be unseaworthy or antiquated or supplanted by a more efficient fighting machine. We are feeding the hunger and stimulating the thirst for war and learning to boast and glory in our power, while we are piling high the burden of debt for war in anticipation even as Louis XIV did for war in fact.

Mr. Chairman, since 1812 there has been no threat or fear or probability of any foreign invasion of the United States. The Monroe doctrine, the most aggressive and self-assertive policy our Nation ever adopted toward foreign nations, was established with scarce a sea force sufficient to be called a "navy." Our limitless resources are known, and in themselves are stronger to deter any nation from striking us than a far larger navy would be to prevent the striking of any weaker nation. Till now also our national love of justice and peace, known of all men, has been a tower of strength to us among the nations of the earth. May God forbid that we should ever take on the pride of the war lord or become with our navy the swaggering bullies of the sea.

Mr. FINLEY. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois now use some of his time.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, there seems no one on this side who wishes to speak, except myself, and I claim the right to close the debate.

Mr. FINLEY. Then I will yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, with a navy greater than any in the world except the English navy, and with an enormous deficit in our revenues, I sincerely hope this amendment striking out the authorization for two battle ships will prevail. If it is adopted, it does not necessarily mean we have changed our naval policy, except in respect to the number and size of ships we will authorize this year, for we have no settled policy in this respect. In the very nature of the case we can not have, for in the matter of naval construction each succeeding Congress necessarily determines for itself the number, size, and cost of naval vessels it will authorize. The next Congress, if it sees fit to do so, can provide for two, or as many battle ships as, in its judgment, is necessary and as the revenues of the Govern-

ment will permit. I want to make it clear that I do not favor the amendment because I am opposed to providing all of the means necessary for our national defense; I favor the amendment because I do not at this time deem it necessary to add to our navy two of the greatest battle ships the world has ever seen, merely to gratify our ambition to excel all other nations in the world in the matter of competitive naval shipbuilding.

For, Mr. Chairman, the country can not escape the conclusion, when it analyzes our situation in respect to our national defense, that there is no real necessity for this very large expenditure of the public money at this time, and that the principal reason for the authorization is an ambition on our part to excel other nations in the matter of naval shipbuilding. This is not alone true of ourselves, but is also true of other nations. A year ago, speaking on the naval budget, the prime minister of England, Mr. Asquith, said:

We do not wish to take the lead, but we want to do everything in our power to prevent a new spurt in competitive shipbuilding between the great naval powers.

In my judgment, we should emulate the example of our sister nation, Great Britain, and strive to check this tendency among the naval powers to excel in naval shipbuilding. In reading the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I find that one of the arguments in support of the recommendation for these two large ships—the largest vessels that ever have been built—is that during the past year the policy of building battle ships of large displacement and high speed has been the policy of other nations.

I have always contended, Mr. Chairman, that we are not justified in determining the size of our navy by the size of other navies, but that the size of our navy should be governed by what is necessary for our national defense, taking into consideration our geographical isolation. And yet it is a fact we should not lose sight of in considering this question that we have to-day a navy which in point of efficiency and in tonnage is second only to one, and that is the navy of Great Britain. From the standpoint, then, of gratifying an ambition to equal, if not excel, other nations in the size of our navy we do not need these two enormous battle ships—enormous in size and enormous in cost—for in size and efficiency our navy is larger than that of any other except the English navy.

In the annual report of the Secretary of the Navy, dated November 30, 1908, it appears that—

During the past year the policy of building battle ships of large displacement and high speed, with main battery guns of the largest caliber, has been universally continued, and all navies are now engaged in or have authorized the construction of such vessels.

And no other argument is advanced in support of the recommendation of the Secretary or of the committee.

It matters not, so far as I am concerned, how many naval vessels other nations, not situated as we are, may construct. We should now determine the question whether or not we at this time should authorize the construction of two of the largest vessels that have ever been launched, in addition to those we now have, independent of what other countries may deem necessary for their defense.

Mr. Chairman, there is a good reason, one perhaps sufficient, to justify the increase in the number and size of vessels of some foreign countries, but it is one that does not apply to us. Take, for example, France, England, and Germany; either can strike the other within a few hours and use their home as a base from which to operate. They are independent nations, having diverse and conflicting interests at home and abroad. If there is any menace to their peace, it is this conflict of interest and this close proximity that causes it and makes it necessary for each of these countries to be prepared to meet the other in war at any time. But we are altogether differently situated. In addition to our navy and in addition to our sea-coast fortifications, we have that which is worth as much to us as a means of national defense as all the navies of the world. We have two oceans, on either side of us, giving us a geographical isolation that is of more value to our defense than all the navies we could build. It is this wide ocean expanse on the east and on the west of us that is entirely ignored in urging the need and extension of our navy beyond anything enjoyed by any other nation.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we hear a great deal at this particular time about the possibility of war with Japan. I am getting somewhat tired of these annually recurring wars with Japan. They are always simultaneous with the consideration of the naval appropriation bill in this House. [Laughter and applause.] During every other week and month in the year we are told our relations with Japan are the most friendly and cordial, but when we come to consider the naval appropriation bill the newspapers are filled with predictions of what may happen

in the future between the United States and Japan. It is a remarkable coincidence that we never hear of war with any country except when we are considering the provisions of this naval bill. Mr. Chairman, it was only a few days ago that I was told by a gentleman who spent some time in Japan last summer that there is absolutely no more danger of war between Japan and the United States than there is of a war between the United States and Great Britain. Our relations with that country were never more friendly than now.

But that is not the only reason why there is no danger of war with Japan. Would Japan, even if she was able financially, ever think of sending a fleet of battle ships from Yokohama to attack our Pacific coast distant 4,200 miles? Her vessels would have to be supplied somewhere in the Pacific Ocean with coal and other supplies. For this purpose a naval base would be as essential to her success as war ships. A war ship without coal may be a thing of beauty, but it is as harmless as a dove. [Applause.] There is no available place in the Pacific Ocean except Hawaii from which a hostile fleet could operate against our Pacific coast, and when we have fortified the Hawaiian Islands, as they will be when the money now appropriated and being appropriated this year is expended, under the recommendations of the Taft Board, the Hawaiian Islands will be as impregnable as Gibraltar, and impossible of being captured by Japan or any other nation.

There is no naval vessel afloat that can sail in time of peace from Yokohama to the Pacific coast and back again with her own coal, a distance of 8,400 miles. Without a naval base in the Pacific no oriental country could send a fleet of naval vessels and accompany that fleet with enough colliers to supply them with the necessary coal. If anyone doubts this let him study the coaling needs of our fleet on its trip around the world and the way those needs were supplied. So I say, Mr. Chairman, from no standpoint are we in any danger of war with Japan or any other oriental country. But we have just recently concluded an agreement with Japan which we were told before the naval bill was brought up for consideration insures the most friendly relations with that country. The country rejoiced over this fact, for our people have always enjoyed and will always endeavor to continue the most peaceful and friendly relations with the people of Japan.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman believe that with all the preparations for defense at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, a successful defense could be made unless we have vessels of equal efficiency to cope with vessels of other countries?

Mr. TAWNEY. In answering the gentleman I will say that that is the judgment of the Taft Board that made recommendations for the fortifications of Hawaii.

Mr. BATES. I am not speaking of the land fortifications, but of the naval preparation by way of modern ships which would be necessary to control the sea, to prevent a successful attack and probable taking of Hawaii and Pearl Harbor by a foreign foe.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the fortifications at Pearl Harbor and at Honolulu, when completed, as recommended by the Taft Board, are not sufficient, are not adequate for the protection of Pearl Harbor and Honolulu, then why have these recommendations been made, and why are we needlessly wasting the public money for the purpose of constructing these fortifications?

Mr. Chairman, on the Atlantic side we are equally secure from effective attack. There is no European country that has a transport service of sufficient capacity to land an army of 100,000 or 150,000 men fully equipped for war on our shore at a given time, even in time of peace.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are not situated as are the other countries with which we are constantly comparing means of national defense. There is no country that can strike us effectively, with the fortifications we now have and with the navy we now have.

But I am not in favor of the amendment alone because I believe it unnecessary at this time to authorize these two large battle ships. There is another reason—one that ought to appeal to the membership of this House and to the country—against this ambitious policy to excel all other nations in the number and size of our war vessels. We are this year spending 40 per cent of all our revenues, exclusive of postal receipts, for preparation for war and about 30 per cent on account of wars past, leaving only 30 per cent for all other governmental purposes, except the postal service. We to-day have a deficit of over \$75,000,000. In other words, we have expended, during the last six months, \$75,000,000 more than we have received. At the end of this fiscal year we will have a deficit of at least \$125,000,000.

Next year, on the basis of existing revenue laws, according to the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury, we will have a deficit of \$143,000,000. We have no money to-day for permanent constructive objects like river and harbor improvements; and you propose, in the face of that fact, to appropriate \$24,000,000 for temporary destructive purposes, or for two \$12,000,000 battle ships. If we could take the \$24,000,000 that will ultimately be placed in these two battle ships and devote that money to river and harbor improvements, that improvement would be permanent and the benefit would be immediate and direct to the people and their commerce. But the people are denied these necessary internal improvements for want of money; and yet, to gratify an ambition to excel all other nations in the matter of shipbuilding, you propose, in the face of a certain deficit of one hundred and twenty-five millions this year and a possible deficit of one hundred and forty-three millions next year, to spend \$24,000,000 in the construction of two ships.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, I do not say that the \$24,000,000 are carried in this bill. Twelve million dollars of it is, and that is only for the cost of the hull and armor of the two ships.

Mr. FOSS. I want to state to the gentleman that the cost of these ships is \$10,250,000 each.

Mr. TAWNEY. In the last session we were told that these *Dreadnoughts* of 20,000-ton burden would cost \$13,000,000. Now, because we have had hard times and are constructing them a little more cheaply, it is estimated that they will cost \$12,000,000, and \$6,000,000 for each ship is carried in this bill, which is only half of the actual cost of the ships. Therefore we will have \$24,000,000 to pay, and nothing but a deficit with which to meet the expenditure. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

[By unanimous consent Mr. TAWNEY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state, for the information of the House, that I have received from the chief constructor of the navy a statement to the effect that the estimated cost of each one of these ships would be \$10,250,000—that is to say, the cost for the two ships will be \$20,500,000 instead of \$24,000,000, as the gentleman from Minnesota has stated in his remarks.

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Illinois takes his seat, I would like to ask him a question. I would like to ask if, for the information of the committee and of the House, he would be good enough to state the reasons that determined the committee to report in favor of the construction of two battle ships—whether it was on representation by officers charged with the defense of the country or from ratiocinations pursued by the committee itself?

Mr. FOSS. I will state to the gentleman that there is in the Navy Department a body called the "General Board," composed of some of the ablest officers in the navy, who, every year, give careful consideration to the subject of the naval programme, and this board made a recommendation that we authorize four battle ships this year. We have, in addition to that, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy to authorize four battle ships, and then upon that comes the recommendation of the President of the United States, in his message sent to Congress, that we authorize four battle ships. Now, all these recommendations came before the committee, and the committee, after careful consideration and discussion, came to the conclusion that it would be wise to recommend half the number, or two battle ships, and accordingly we recommend that number in this bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FOSS. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Are we to infer from that that the judgment of the committee is half as wise as that of the board, or twice as wise? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman can figure that out for himself. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, we always have opposition to every effort that is made to increase the military power of this Government, but I have never heard so trivial a reason or one so dishonoring to the people of the United States assigned to those who desire to increase the military power of the United States as that which was made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] a little while ago. He told us that the sole purpose of those who wanted to have an adequate navy was because of an ambition to excel in naval architecture. He told us, aside from the possibility of war, aside from the solicitude that patriots may have for the performances of their Government in case war does come, he imputes to us simply the ignoble purpose

of desiring to build better ships than some other nation. I scout that suggestion of the gentleman as an insult to the American people. Those who favor an adequate navy do so because they recognize the fact that the American people are a warlike people. Every generation of Americans has had its war, as probably every generation will.

There is a passion for military glory in the breast of all Americans, and while we talk of ourselves as a Christian people, intent upon securing the spread of peace over all the nations, yet we have had how many wars, Mr. Chairman—1812, 1846, 1861, and 1898. In less than a century this Christian people has had four wars. And, Mr. Chairman, let me call attention to that other fact that in each one of them we went in without being prepared. In the war of 1812 we went in without either army or navy and threw down our challenge to the most powerful nation on earth. The war of 1846 found us without preparation, and preparation had to be made after hostilities began. So it was with the war of 1898. The first thing we did was to appropriate \$50,000,000 to bring up our war establishment to the condition that it ought to have been in time of peace. We have always listened to the siren song of those gentlemen who say, "You will never need an army; you will never need a navy;" and how gratifying it must be to all in authority to listen to the assurances of the gentleman from Minnesota that there can be no further wars, that we are to be exempt from all of these curses that come to other nations through national conflict. Here is to be peace. And we have the word of the gentleman from Minnesota that no hostile force can reach our shores. Then why be timid? If the good people along the northern Atlantic coast in 1898 had known what he knows there would have been no solicitude when it was rumored that the Spanish fleet was approaching our coast, and the good people of Boston would not have carried all of their portable valuables hundreds of miles into the interior [laughter] if they had only known what the gentleman from Minnesota knows and could only have been so fully established in their ideas of security as is the doughty gentleman from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Now, if the gentleman had told us that no hostile fleet could have ever reached the capital city of his district, I would have thought possibly he might be correct [laughter], certainly at this season of the year. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, every man knows that if an insult comes to our Government from any foreign government, there will be reparation or war. Why talk about peace when we recognize that fact? The war spirit that is in the hearts, ah, in the blood, of young America would force any administration into hostility. What cause of war other than sentiment had we in 1898? Yet, when the sentiments of the American people were outraged they did not stop. The Government tried to do so, the administration did everything possible, the President held back, but this impulse that is in the hearts and in the blood of Americans, when there was a people alien to us, not of our blood, in whom we had no especial interest, and whom tyranny trampled upon, demanded that we should go to their rescue, without hesitation, without preparation, without a fitting army or a competent navy, we did; and the very first step was to appropriate by a vote that was unanimous, a vote in which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] participated, a vote in which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW], I think, said "aye," we appropriated \$50,000,000, not for the purpose of putting our Nation in that condition that it ought to have been for the purposes of that war, but to bring it up to even the peace standard that was creditable to the Nation.

And, Mr. Chairman, one of the evidences that seems to me to be so important in this matter, that proves the war spirit of the Americans, is found in the fact that the \$50,000,000 was put into the hands of the President without limitation, except to expend it to put us as nearly as possible into a war condition; and up to this moment, Mr. Chairman, there has been no request from any human being as to how that \$50,000,000 was expended.

Now, Mr. Chairman—

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. I will yield five minutes more to the gentleman, if he desires.

Mr. HEPBURN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that now is the time to secure an efficient navy. That our navy is commensurate with our wants, I do not believe. The gentleman from Minnesota tells us, with gravity, that our situation is such that we need less of sea armament than other nations may need; that we have two coasts, the Atlantic and the Pacific, and therefore we do not need the same power upon the sea. I do not look at that fact as the gentleman from Minnesota does. It seems to me, sir, that this separation of our coasts makes a larger navy more necessary. I think

that the fact that we have 3,000 miles upon the Pacific, and a larger number of miles upon the Atlantic and the Gulf, to defend, the two being separated, requiring weeks in order to send relief from one to the other, makes it necessary that we should be prepared for any emergency. That is a source of weakness, not a source of strength. The gentleman says that no naval force from the West or from the Far East can ever reach our Atlantic coast in an efficient condition.

I do not know that, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman will pardon me if I express some doubt as to whether he knows it. What may be done is still a matter of conjecture, and especially what may be done by the Japanese now or by the Chinese in a score of years from now. I do not want war with any nation. I hope we never may have another declaration of war from our Government, but I want to be prepared for it, and as one of the means for securing answers to the prayers for peace that I put forth I want to see such a navy as will suggest to our proposed assailants that there is peril in the assault. I want him to know that assault can be repelled. I do not want the disgraceful spectacle that has been witnessed time and again, at least on two or three occasions, because in our parsimony, or in our hopes for peace that have always been illusive, we have failed to prepare.

Once, gentlemen may remember, when we were defying Great Britain and seeking war with her, the declaration was made when the only preparation that was indulged in was the building of certain gunboats of about from 20 to 30 tons burden, each armed with a swivel gun, and so disproportioned was armament to hull that when the gun was fired across the side of a vessel it immediately capsized and proceeded to the bottom of the river that it was to defend. [Laughter.] And our whole defense when we went into the war of 1812 was 67 out of 200 gunboats of that character. [Applause.]

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that if we should adopt the amendment, it will be taken as a declaration to the world that we do not expect and that we do not desire war. I believe that it will contribute to the success of the efforts of the patriotic and intelligent men throughout the world who have dedicated themselves to the honorable work of preserving peace, and who hope and expect that this country will lead in that great work. It is reasonable to expect it, because we are so situated that we need not look upon an assault from any outside government on earth as containing the least element of success should such an assault be made. Our isolation, which really is splendid, added to the resources of the country, makes us absolutely secure.

Mr. Chairman, both Houses of Congress constantly preach economy, and just as persistently practice extravagance. This bill is a striking illustration of the extravagance that has characterized us for a number of years. Briefly, I want to call attention to a few figures, and ask that gentlemen consider them before they cast their vote upon this amendment. Last year, as I recall it, the Committee on Naval Affairs carried through this House a bill that appropriated about \$103,000,000. That bill was increased when it reached the other legislative body, until finally the appropriation carried was one hundred and twenty-two million six hundred and sixty-two thousand and odd dollars. The estimates submitted to the committee for this particular bill were in amount \$134,393,447.99. The bill exceeds the estimates by a considerable figure, for it carries \$135,662,888.25.

Mr. FOSS. May I interrupt the gentleman right there?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, I have only five minutes. I will yield if the gentleman will agree to give me a little time.

Mr. FOSS. Well, go on.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, that committee which is headed by the gentleman from Illinois is unique among the committees of this House. We have a bill brought in by that committee that exceeds the estimates submitted to the committee by the department.

Mr. FOSS. I will give the gentleman further time if he will permit me to interrupt him.

Mr. SLAYDEN. How much time will the gentleman give me?

Mr. FOSS. I want to say to him that the department never sent in estimates for the new ships; but in this bill we have appropriated about \$15,000,000 for the new ships, and these

estimates are not sent in as regular estimates submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that is the reason why.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The bill exceeds the estimate, and that is the point. In the gentleman's argument he undertakes to show that his committee is not controlled by bureau estimates. I am glad to hear it, but if he is right in his contention I am forced to the conclusion that estimates are persistently made greater than actual requirements, for, notwithstanding he claims to be economical, his appropriations grow so steadily and rapidly that I fear he and his committee will soon bankrupt the Government. I fear that estimates are deliberately made excessive in order to get what the department really wants. They ask for four ships when they want two, and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I think there is nothing more absurd than the alarm that gentlemen feel about the dangers that they suppose menace us from the East.

According to the table prepared by the committee and submitted by them, the entire tonnage of the Japanese Government, built and building, is 440,000 tons, against 770,408 tons, built and building, on the part of the United States, which does not include the two battle ships, the *Florida* and the *Utah*. Take these in your estimate, and it will very materially increase the difference in our favor as compared with that of Japan.

Mr. Chairman, the coincidence of the consideration of this bill and these alarms of war, with which year by year our people are frightened, has commanded my attention for some time, and it makes me suspicious of the sincerity of the pleas that are made for the increase of the navy. It has happened when our fleet is in the Pacific Ocean that Germany was the favorite enemy. It happens that when our fleet is upon the Atlantic, Japan is our favorite enemy; and I am forced to believe that if we should send our fleet to the Arctic, then Argentina would be the favorite enemy of these gentlemen, who want to tear down the doors of the Treasury and expend every dollar that can be collected from the people by extravagant and unfair taxation.

Japan has a navy just a little more than half as large as ours. She has just emerged from a war that everybody will admit exhausted her physically and financially. She won every battle in that great struggle, but each victory brought her nearer to exhaustion. Had Russia only persisted a little longer—and no thoughtful student of events doubts that she would have persisted but for internal disorders—a different story in all probability would have been written.

This is no impeachment of the character and courage of the Japanese. The sacrifices they made for their fatherland, their resistless and patriotic enthusiasm, testify to their character, and their courage is proven by their conduct in the greatest battles ever fought.

But courage and enthusiasm alone do not wage wars and win battles. In the long run it is resources that count.

Japan has a population about half as great as ours. Her people cultivate farms that average in area only 3 or 4 acres. Every member of a Japanese family, from the oldest down to the youngest that can possibly do so, and of both sexes, has to be almost continuously at work to keep from starving. A drought or a flood, a disaster of any sort, seriously affects the whole people. Famine is created in Japan or China or India by conditions that would hardly secure a newspaper paragraph in the United States.

To-day the credit of Japan, the victor, is hardly so good as that of Russia, the defeated. Market quotations of national credit issues tell the tale.

Over against Japan's limited resources and smaller population, her famine conditions and reduced credit, I place our own vast country with its enormous population and resources that are beyond computation and comprehension.

I ask you to look at the quotation of her 4 per cent bonds and compare them with the market value of our 2 per cent bonds. I ask you to be reasonable and practical in your consideration of this absurd war scare.

On our side of the Pacific Ocean Japan has no coal or coaling stations. On all the Pacific coast, from the Isthmus to the State of Washington, there is no coal. We find it only in British Columbia. It is preposterous to think that England would permit her colony to give such aid and comfort to an enemy of the United States as to equip her with a war material like coal. The English are not only our kinsmen, they are also sensible people. They need us in trade, to take the lowest possible view of their probable course of action in such a contingency as gentlemen seem to fear.

If Japan were to send war ships to our shores on a hostile mission they would be helpless when they got here. England alone could be of assistance in that crisis, and common sense tells us she would not take sides against us.

Californians are needlessly alarmed—if they are alarmed, which I doubt.

A distinguished military officer told me the other day that San Francisco was perfectly defended—overdefended were his exact words—against an attack from the sea.

Suppose—and it is a wild and an absurd conjecture—that Japan could land an army. We wouldn't be idle. We could meet it, and I know that we could take care of it, too.

We are gradually erecting a system of coast defenses from Maine to western Texas and from southern California to northern Washington. The Atlantic defenses are nearly, if not quite, complete. The Gulf has not yet been as perfectly fortified as it will be, and that work is now being done. I am willing that it should be abandoned until my Pacific coast brethren have had their nerves quieted. We are not alarmed either for our commerce or our lives.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that we are military mad. Much more than half of our revenues are now devoted to military, naval, and pension expenses. Our schools are training depots for soldiers. Half the students are in uniform. A commission in the army or navy is looked upon as the greatest reward that our young men can seek. It spells ruin for the Republic unless we can reverse the thoughts of our people.

The Declaration of Independence is out of fashion. It was described by one of our uniformed statesmen as a "damned inflammable document." We govern 10,000,000 alien people against their will. A large number of people hope to govern more yet in the West Indies. This expansion, this government of an alien people, is tied up with the military idea. It requires more armies and navies, more commissions, and more promotions, and so it is popular.

If we had not committed the political crime and stupidity of acquiring the Philippines, we would never have heard of war with Japan; and even the most timid will admit that we would have been in no danger if such a war had come under such circumstances.

But Japan wants no war. Her rulers are wise men; they know how such a war would end. They have shown ability of the highest order, and they will never be persuaded that a little success in the Philippines, or even a foray on the Pacific coast of North America, will compensate them for the price they would finally pay.

Another thought I would like for Members to consider before they vote for the big increase in the navy.

These tremendous appropriations, plus the deficit that will be more than \$125,000,000 by June 30 of the current year, will indefinitely postpone the river and harbor work that we all want in order that our commerce may be prospered.

Which will you have, deeper harbors and better river navigation, with the cheaper freight rates that they will bring, or more battle ships that we do not need and that will be in the scrap heap in ten years?

I insert with my remarks the document entitled "Thirty Reasons Why Our Navy Should Not Be Enlarged."

#### THIRTY REASONS WHY OUR NAVY SHOULD NOT BE ENLARGED.

The following statement of reasons why our navy should not be enlarged is issued with the indorsement of a large body of the leading men of the country, including Charles Francis Adams, James Addams, Samuel Bowles, John Graham Brooks, Andrew Carnegie, James Duncan, President Faunce, of Brown University, A. B. Farquhar, Edwin Glinn, Washington Gladden, Edward Everett Hale, William D. Howells, Chester Holcombe, Prof. William James, Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, President Jordan, of Leland Stanford University, Bishop William N. McJannet, Marcus Marks, N. O. Nelson, Gen. William J. Palmer, Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, George Foster Peabody, Bliss Perry, Dean Henry Wade Rogers, of the Yale Law School, Prof. William G. Sumner, Lincoln Steffens, Ida M. Tarbell, President Thwing, of Western Reserve University, President Thompson, of the State University of Ohio, Booker T. Washington, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, President Mary E. Woolley, of Mount Holyoke College, and others.

1. Because we have fought foreign foes—English, Spanish, and Mexican—only six years in the one hundred and twenty-five years since the Revolution. In every foreign war we made the first attack. With less danger from attack than any other nation, we are now spending more for past war and preparation for future war than any other nation in the world.

2. Because our extent of coast line has little relation to danger from attack. The second Hague conference has provided for immunity from bombardment of all unfortified towns and from levying contributions by threat of bombardment. We should be safer still if we reduced fortifications, as one of our delegates to The Hague has said.

3. Because The Hague conference also provided for arbitration of disputes over contractual debts, thereby removing excuse for our keeping a navy to prevent forcible collection of such debts of South America to Europe.

4. Because a navy is less needed than ever to protect South America, as it is now perfectly capable of a defensive alliance among its nations to repel any wanton attack from outside. Reasons which made the Monroe doctrine necessary when there was a "holy alliance" and the weak South American republics were unconnected by telegraphs or railroads have no application when modern communications, soon to include the Panama Canal, and enormously increased population, wealth, and mutual friendship make them now far from eager to continue our overlordship. With the price of a few torpedo boats we might secure by education and diplomacy a federation of South American states.

5. Because there is no danger from China, a peace-loving nation friendly to us. Our return of the indemnity has done more to promote peace with her than anything else could do. According to the testimony of Ambassador Luke Wright, of Hon. John W. Foster, of Secretary Taft, and of over 100 missionaries to Japan, familiar with her language, customs, and politics, there is not the slightest foundation for the violent and frothy talk which is emanating from a few Americans against Japan and is poisoning the minds of millions of our uninformed citizens. Said Ambassador Wright: "The talk of war between this country and Japan is not even respectable nonsense." The 100 missionaries say: "We desire to place on record our profound appreciation of the kind treatment which we experience at the hands of both Government and people; our belief is that the alleged belligerent attitude of the Japanese does not represent the real sentiments of the people. We wish to bear testimony to the sobriety, sense of international justice, and freedom from aggressive designs exhibited by the great majority of the Japanese people." Nothing could do more to develop the opposite feeling than the baseless assumption and insulting statements published by certain irresponsible newspapers and military men.

6. Because of an excessive, unhealthy reliance on force in our country in recent years, which calls attention away from the real foes at home to supposititious foreign enemies. Its spirit fills the newspapers with reckless, unfounded suspicions and accusations, distorting historic statements, promotes constant talk about war and preparation for war, of maneuvers, promotions, and technical details, and makes us blind to the real sources of our greatest loss of life and property.

7. Because our three foreign wars since 1781, which lasted only six years, cost in life, all told, in battle nothing comparable with our reckless slaughter by accidents every year in time of peace. The \$60,000,000 increase of the navy asked for last year, if spent in fighting disease, ignorance, waste, and wickedness at home, probably could save as much life and property as all our foreign and civil wars have cost. In five years we have lost alone by fire, largely preventable, \$1,200,000,000.

8. Because we are already spending over 65 per cent of the Nation's revenue in payment for past war and in preparation for future war, and have but one-third of our national revenue left for judicial and executive departments, coast guard, light-houses, quarantine, custom-houses, post-offices, census, waterways, forestry, consular and diplomatic service, and all other constructive work.

9. Because we have increased our expenditure for defense 200 times during a period when our population has increased only 22 times, our coast line perhaps 3 times, and our danger from attack not at all.

10. Because we are protected by nature as is no other country, and have not the excuse for a great navy which England has, nor for a strong army which Germany has. Our wealth is as great a protection as our geographical position. We supply our own necessities and are not dependent, as many nations are. General Sheridan said that no nation on the Continent of Europe had sufficient ships to spare to bring over enough soldiers to carry on one campaign so far from its base of supplies.

11. Because we shall need no navy to protect the Philippines if we but ask the nations to pledge preservation of their autonomy when we grant them their independence. No nation could refuse or would dare wantonly break such a pledge made to the world. The neutralization, in this manner, of exposed places is one of the most successful methods of preventing war which we can further use. The pledge between the United States and Great Britain to remove battle ships and forts from our Canadian border has since 1817 secured peace at no expense on over 3,000 miles of frontier. Without this pledge we should probably have had war. So long as this line is unguarded we shall never fight Great Britain.

12. Because all the great nations, in one place or another, are securing safety from territorial aggrandizement by pledging territorial inviolability. All the nations on the Baltic and North seas signed treaties in April, 1908, to respect each other's territory on those waters. Turbulent Central America has secured peace by similar methods. It is the method of the future.

13. Because, in spite of our strategic position and the fact that Europe largely depends on us for food, we are spending for defense more than France and only \$36,000,000 less than Germany, and only \$66,000,000 less than Great Britain, which has possessions to protect around the globe and is unable to feed herself except by imports.

14. Because labor put into the construction of armaments could be better employed to increase our insufficient railroad capacity and as many men could be employed in making rails and engines, of which we have too few to move our crops, as in making armor plate and instruments of destruction.

15. Because the recent arbitration treaties signed with Great Britain, France, Norway, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Japan, and Germany minimize the possibility of war with those countries, and we have no fear of any others.

16. Because, as was unanimously agreed at the arbitration conference in 1904 in Washington, attended by a great body of our most eminent public men, there is no question of "honor" or "vital interest" which can not be arbitrated, except, of course, that of autonomy, which can be secured by international pledge, and in our case is beyond menace. Some of the smaller nations have already agreed to arbitrate every question. There is no excuse for increased armaments until we have at least tried to get the great powers to pledge themselves to arbitrate every question with us.

17. Because we can secure far greater safety by expending on a peace budget a small amount every year, say, \$1 out of every thousand voted for armaments. Last year that would have been \$220,000, which, in the hands of a commission, could have brought 100 eminent Japanese here and sent 100 of our Congressmen and editors to Japan. Banquets, speeches, interviews, lectures, etc., would have brought about an understanding and friendship which might have easily prevented the vote for a new *Dreadnought*. This method was recommended by the Interparliamentary Union, and is worth more even than the ounce of prevention which is worth a pound of cure. Courtesy and good will are more powerful than explosives in preventing war.

18. Because a national and racial arrogance is growing in our country, and bumptious talk about our being "master of the Pacific," though there are ten other nations bordering on it, is leading a part of our press and people to insult and irritate other peoples with the sense of impunity in our impudence which a huge navy lends. We, as well as other nations, have found easy euphemisms to ease our consciences when using our military power to further our own ends. We shall be far less likely to be hot-headed and rash and to rush into needless war if we do not increase our navy. It is naive conceit to say that we are so peaceful and just that we can never be tempted to wage a needless war. The war with Mexico was fought in the interest of slavery, and was called iniquitous by General Grant, who fought in

it. Said Secretary of State Sherman concerning the Spanish war, "We could have adjusted our difficulties without the loss of blood and treasure." Said Congressman Boutelle, "President McKinley, if Congress had left the matter to him, would have secured everything we wanted in Cuba without the sacrifice of one drop of American or Spanish blood."

19. Because our navy is already so large as to incite other nations to increase theirs. Our naval increase was quoted last year in the French Assembly as an argument for a French increase. This senseless rivalry is driving certain would-be customers of ours toward bankruptcy.

20. Because increase of our navy does not increase respect of foreigners for us. Respect can be given only to moral qualities. Our indifference to lawlessness and our civic corruption are well known abroad. We have no more moral influence than we had thirty years ago, when every monarchy in Europe was being sapped by our democracy. Plutocracy and militarism make us talked of and dreaded, but not respected. Many, perhaps, are glad that we are being hampered in our race for commercial supremacy by saddling ourselves with the Old World's military burdens.

21. Because our dignity no more depends on battle ships than upon light-houses or fire engines. We should feel pride if we are safe enough to dispense with a few. A European city built of stone rejoices that it does not need our costly fire apparatus. A large navy is a confession of conscious weakness or timidity.

22. Because increase of the navy is an implication that new dangers are in sight and old friends are to be suspected. It arouses rivalry and irritation with other nations. The two nations to-day who are the most armed are in the most danger of fighting. Just as Germany's and England's increase of naval power mutually irritates each other, so Japan's military skill has stirred the emulation of our jingoes, masking themselves under the conceited plea that we are par excellence the peaceful people of the world and can do no wrong with our navy.

23. Because "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind" ought to be more and more the controlling motive of nations as of individuals. A navy is but a small element in our defense, even from foreign foes, to say nothing of defense from our far greater domestic dangers to life and property. We have been secure from attack with our fleet at the antipodes.

24. Because the demand for it comes chiefly from those who ignore the new substitutes for war, and whose military training fits them only to kill enemies, but not to prevent friends becoming enemies. They understand explosives, but not human nature or politics or diplomacy or the methods which have produced the astounding bloodless revolution in Turkey, or the demand comes from the class which supplies implements of war and surreptitiously keeps up war scares which the gullible voters make profitable to them.

25. Because declaration of nonintercourse embodied in treaties is a feasible and far more powerful force. We would better spend our energy in studying this new agent, advocated by Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court and other able men, now made possible by modern conditions of communication and politics. If one tithe of the \$60,000,000 asked for were spent on an educational campaign for a pledge of nonintercourse from England, France, and the United States against any nation which attacked one of them and refused to arbitrate, it would do more to keep the world's peace than all their navies. Were two of these strong nations previously to make public their signed agreements to withdraw diplomats and stop commerce upon wanton attack on the third power, no nation would ever attack the third. The declaration would suffice. This is a totally different thing from the old-fashioned embargo declared by one nation on another after war began. Even the unorganized Chinese boycotts, not backed by the Chinese Government, made us remove injustices, and more recently coerced Japan. If in fifteen years 400,000,000 organized Chinese refuse to buy goods if they are ill treated, the greatest navies will avail nothing to get their markets.

26. Because new inventions in all probability will make existing armaments useless before Japan, even if she wanted to attack us, could recuperate from her financial drain sufficiently to do so. Air ships may make battle ships useless.

27. Because an increase of the navy argues infidelity to the great achievements of The Hague conventions. It is childishly inconsistent to create more force when better methods are being substituted for it.

28. Because every enlargement of the navy draws men from constructive work. It keeps them always on the outlook for the trouble which alone could give them the sense of being of real service and importance, and getting promotions and honors. Advocates of large navies are notably skeptical about other methods than force for promoting peace, and draw the attention of the public away from the quiet and effective to the old-fashioned methods which tickle eye and ear with noisy and spectacular effects.

29. Because by lowering excessive tariffs and thus promoting commercial fraternity we could do more for peace than through intimidation by armaments.

30. Because we have not the faintest ground to suspect there will ever be a war again with England so long as our northern frontier is free from her fortifications; nor with Spain, whose interests hereafter can not cross ours; nor with any of the other nations with whom we have always been at peace, and who could fight us only at a range of thousands of miles from their base of supplies. We are especially secure, as Europe is dependent on us for a large share of her food supply, and the Orient has everything to lose and nothing to gain by attacking us. The "Yellow Peril" is a psychological obsession of a few scaremongers who do not read oriental languages or respect people who have not white skins, but who translate their suspicions into statements which are not facts, and help create the very hostility that would excuse their cry for an increased navy.

JANUARY 15, 1909.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to inquire what time has been consumed on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has consumed forty minutes' time and the gentleman from Illinois twenty-one minutes.

Mr. FOSS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not hesitate, Mr. Chairman, to say that I yield to no gentleman upon the floor of this House a greater desire to preserve the peace of our country than I entertain myself. I was glad to hear the distinguished gentleman

from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] express the views that he did in regard to his desire to preserve peace.

He knows, as I do, the horrors of war, for we have both experienced it in all its terrors, and he is anxious, as I am, to preserve peace. Yet I believe, Mr. Chairman, in the wise and patriotic policy "That in the time of peace we should prepare for war." Not a war of oppression, but for defense. I am an advocate of the two battle ships recommended by the Naval Committee, and shall vote against the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina to strike these battle ships from the bill. I find ample justification for thus voting in one interest relating to the increase of cotton consumption in the South. Born and reared in the South, loving all of its traditions, as I do, I am eager to aid to develop the wealth and power that the South holds in its unquestioned monopoly in the great staple—cotton. It is more to the interest of the South to-day and the advancement and welfare of our cotton interests than any other section of the Union, that we should be prepared to defend the contention that we are making to-day for supremacy in trade when our rights or interests are denied or imperiled by anyone.

Who can forget that it was but a few short months since that Japan, with the passive consent of Russia, was preparing to violate one of the most important provisions of the Portsmouth treaty by disregarding the sovereignty of China in Manchuria? Japan sought by the right acquired to build railroads to usurp the authority of China, which meant the "closing of the open door of trade." Who stopped it? It was the protest of Great Britain, with the aid and cooperation of the Government of the United States. Why was it stopped? It was because Japan was threatening "the open door," which the South depends on to enlarge her cotton-cloth trade with China, Japan, and Manchuria. We depend on this China trade because our southern mills manufacture the coarse grade of cotton cloth. Have we forgotten that in the Boxer troubles in China the cotton mills of Georgia and Alabama and other Southern States were to a great extent injured by this disturbance in the decreased product of their mills? Then I say that it is more important, in my judgment—if I am allowed to use that argument in behalf of the advancement of the interests of the South in its great expectations of the cotton trade—to stand by a condition that keeps us prepared to assert our authority when our rights are invaded. I am earnestly for peace.

I do not, Mr. Chairman, advocate this measure to-day in order to put my country even with Great Britain in the number of battle ships, or with Germany or with France or with any other of the great powers of the world, but I advocate it simply on the common-sense grounds that we ought to be prepared, not by any means to be aggressive, but to assert our authority and protect our rights. I am not an alarmist. I see no reason to believe that we are likely to have war with Japan. I am one of that class who believes that Japan is in no manner prepared or willing to go to war with us. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I do not see any war cloud above our horizon. I have an abiding faith in the diplomatic wisdom of our country to avoid war and preserve peace with all the powers of the world. But when I see, Mr. Chairman, the great struggle that we are participating in—that we must take part in—with the great powers of the world for the supremacy of trade and commerce, I realize, as a practical proposition, friction and strife of a most serious character may arise at any time. If we are prepared and ready to assert and defend our rights, the friction and trouble over commercial interests are not so likely to arise. Being ready is a wholesome preventive of war and the strongest maintenance of peace. It is, Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the honor and manhood of our Republic that I am an advocate of a sufficient navy. We all admit that if we ever have war with any nation it will occur on the "high seas."

I am, Mr. Chairman, opposed to what gentlemen denounce as "governmental extravagance," and would vote to curtail expenses when I can consistently with the welfare of our country. I do think it a wise policy to build and keep up a good navy.

[The time of Mr. RICHARDSON having expired, he asked unanimous consent for three minutes more.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not control the time.

Mr. BUTLER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman the three minutes which have been promised me. He will advocate this proposition more eloquently than I could.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I say, Mr. Chairman, it is not a spirit of rivalry to equal other nations on my part that actuates me to contend for these battle ships. I care not how many Great Britain has. Strike out the two battle ships, and what condition do you leave us

in? Are we thus to abandon the wise policy of gradually enlarging and improving our navy? I have been taught, sir, by a great Alabamian, who was Secretary of the Navy, and who took an immense pride in laying the foundation of an improved navy, that such a policy was wise and patriotic.

Since I have been a Member of Congress I have advocated the improvement of our navy by a fixed policy of authorizing annually the construction of a certain reasonable number of battle ships until we could fairly say that we were, as a Republic, prepared for any contingency. I did not consider these views chimerical, and I do not now. I know I differ with many of my Democratic colleagues on this side. I am not the victim of "frenzy, hysteria, or mania." I say, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to look at it practically, not influenced by what the President of the United States may have said or done, but look at it from a common-sense business view, in the interests of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I hope this committee will vote for two battle ships. I listened to the argument made last year by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and this year to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW], and I can agree with them only in so far as they believe that no war is imminent. I believe that no war threatens the United States to-day; but when the gentleman from Missouri proceeds to maintain that the defense of this country rests on what he is pleased to call "the enlightened sentiment of the world" I would tell him that when the time of need comes the defense of the United States rests upon the battle ships and upon the strong right arm of the American people. [Applause.]

The gentleman says that he attended the last congress at The Hague. Well, so did I; and I want to ask the gentleman whether, in pursuance of his belief that the enlightened conscience of the world is sufficient to maintain the rights of a non-military nation; he recalls that the delegates of the "Hermit Kingdom" knocked at the door of that conference, demanding in the name of peace that the delegates should secure to them their threatened independence, which they had held for more than a thousand years, and I will ask the gentleman whether he did not see the doors of that conference shut in their faces?

I will ask the gentleman from Ohio the further question, whether, in pursuance of his stated faith that the peace of the world rests upon the enlightened conscience of mankind, he can not recall that a few years ago the greatest military imperial power of modern times engulfed the independent nation of the Boers in the pursuit of territorial aggrandizement?

Mr. Chairman, in the three minutes allotted to me I have not time to go into this question very deeply, but I advocate the building of these two battle ships as a measure of insurance, because I believe that this is the best way to insure peace; and if war ever does come, I want to be able to feel in my own heart, and I want to be able to tell my family, that while there was time I did my share in maintaining the national defense. [Applause.]

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this side has consumed more time than the other. We only have two additional speeches, and I would like to have gentlemen use some time on that side.

Mr. FOSS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment offered striking out the battle ships from the naval programme this year will be voted down. I believe in standing by the President of the United States and the General Naval Board, of which Admiral Dewey is chairman; also the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and the unanimous recommendation of the House Committee on Naval Affairs. They all ask us to vote for at least two new ships. I believe it is the duty of this American Congress to continue the navy of this country in its present state of efficiency, and if I make no other point in the few moments allotted to me, I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that a vote for this amendment to strike the battle ships out of the naval programme is a vote in favor of going backward, and in favor of actually losing ground. I do not believe that the American people who send us here desire that the navy shall retrograde and fall below the present state of efficiency in which we have placed it in the last ten years. We will go back on our splendid record of the last decade if we vote for this amendment striking the two battle ships out of the naval programme.

In 1892, 1893, and 1894 authorization was made for the building of certain ships of war. They were the *Indiana*, the *Massachusetts*, the *Oregon*, the *Brooklyn*, the *Iowa*, and the *Minnesota*. Within a few years more these ships were equipped and delivered, and within two or three years more events occurred in this nation which made those names household words.

When these ships were authorized, when their keels were laid, when they were delivered to the country there was no more thought and no more danger of war than there is this minute, and it is not with the idea of the danger of war that the Naval Committee brings in the report authorizing the building of two battle ships this year. It is to be in consonance, in harmony with the naval programme which we have followed for the last ten years. These battle ships and cruisers, whose names I have called, are to-day obsolete and practically relegated to the ships of the second class. Not to build and not to authorize the building of two or three or four battle ships each year is a vote of retrogression, because the life of an ordinary cruiser or battle ship is only fifteen or eighteen years.

The gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Missouri talk of peace. I am a member of that same Interparliamentary Peace Conference that has met from year to year and to which they refer.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BATES. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Is it understood that ships authorized as recently as 1892, and perhaps built a little later, are now worthless?

Mr. BATES. They are practically obsolete to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. What foundation has the gentleman for making such a statement?

Mr. BATES. Just the fact; and if the gentleman desires to look it up, he can do so. It is the statement of the Secretaries of the Navy for the past ten years. I am as much in favor of peace as the gentlemen who cry peace on this floor, but I want to ask those apostles of peace—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, what nation prevails most in crying peace, the efficient nation prepared for war or the weak, pusillanimous nation without any navy or army or any strength whatever before the nations of the world? Who was it who made immortal the words "Let us have peace?" Was it a weak, pusillanimous general who was loafing about Washington displaying his epaulets? No; it was a man who was the greatest commander this earth has ever seen, who had been a thunderbolt in war and who had led his legions victorious in every battle, and when he said, "Let us have peace," those words struck home and rang all around the world; and so with this Nation, if she is strong, if she is efficient, if she commands the best navy on the globe, when she utters the words, "Let us have peace," those words will prevail in every portion of the globe. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BATES. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Who is the more worthy citizen, the man with the revolver in his pocket or the other who goes unarmed?

Mr. BATES. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that we always equip our policemen with weapons to be used in case of necessity, and such officers are always most efficient in compelling and maintaining peace. Not that they often use them, but the knowledge that they have arms makes their presence a sign of peace and tranquillity, never a sign of disturbance.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But I am talking about citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time for the purpose of stating my position in regard to this amendment, and my position with regard to the proposition to authorize two battle ships this year. I would be as willing as any man to curtail the naval expenditures if this Nation of ours was in the position it was some years ago, and which the fathers of the Nation fondly hoped and advised it would continue to be, but, in my judgment, the two battle ships carried in this appropriation bill are the natural corollary of the action of this Government in taking possession of the Philippine Islands. I believe that we made a gigantic mistake when we carried the frontiers of our country thousands of miles into the ocean. I am in favor now of getting rid of the Philippine Islands.

I am not in favor exactly of the policy which has been denominated by the term "scuttling," because I do not believe that method would be effectual. I do not think you could bore a hole in the Philippine Islands and cause them to sink into the sea, because I believe that if it was possible to do that it would have been done long ago. I believe that we must leave to the party which gave us this incubus, which hung this millstone around our necks, and which makes it necessary for us to con-

stantly appropriate great sums of money, the task of getting us out of the Philippine Islands with honor, even though it be at a great cost in blood and treasure. I can see that, having possession of the Philippine Islands, we are open to possible humiliation. Any nation wishing to engage in war with us, in my judgment, would naturally attack the Philippine Islands. They would obtain a footing there and they would intrench themselves and then we would be called upon to ship soldiers and to send our fleet to regain that which was of little or no advantage to us, but which became immensely important before we could ask our people to let us enter upon negotiations for a treaty of peace. He would be a brave man, indeed, who would urge negotiation of a treaty with the Philippine Islands in the possession of some power that had gone to war with us. So I believe that so long as we retain the Philippine Islands we must depend upon the navy to protect the national honor there and to prevent us from humiliation in that quarter. Consequently it is with confidence that I can go before my people to justify my act in voting for these two ships. [Applause.]

[Mr. BURTON of Ohio addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN].

Mr. COCKRAN. Mr. Chairman, with almost everything which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has said by way of argument I am in hearty accord. For the oratorical embellishments of his speech I have unstinted admiration. From the conclusion he has reached my dissent is radical and profound. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] both seem to labor under the impression that it rests with this country to decide for itself whether there be a necessity for increasing its armament. In this I think both are radically mistaken, and from that fundamental, original misconception they have reached a conclusion which, I submit to this body, it would be very dangerous for us to adopt.

Mr. Chairman, I am far from concurring with the statement of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEBURN] that every generation must necessarily have its war. I believe that there is a prospect, and a steadily improving prospect, of peace throughout the world. I believe that as we have seen such progress during the last century that to-day men are moving about the highways in civilized communities without swords at their sides or arms in their hands, so we may hope to see the nations realize before the close of this century that war and preparations for war are a useless and senseless waste of treasure and of energy. But even in the most highly civilized communities in this civilization of ours we are still compelled to maintain jails and scaffolds, criminal courts and peace officers to restrain some men from invading the rights of others. And the nations have not yet reached the point, I am sorry to say, where they can find it safe to put away their arms or disband their armies and trust for the maintenance of peace to the merit of their policy or the excellence of their intentions.

Mr. Chairman, while I believe it would be unsafe to hold that war is an impossible contingency I am happy to say the tendency of events everywhere is toward conditions which make for peace throughout the world. The circle of regard for justice, among nations as among individuals, is widening every day. With the gentleman from Ohio I do not believe there is a possibility that war can ever be made upon this country through the deliberately aggressive act of any foreign government. I am sure this Government will never undertake to make war on any other country. If war is to come, it will be not through the policy or disposition of this Government or any other to make it, but in spite of all that every government can do to avert it. I do not believe there is the slightest possibility of war between this and any Christian country. And I hold this belief, not because of the common civilization that all Christian nations maintain, but by reason of necessities that bind them all to this country in a common interest of vital importance.

Were we at war to-morrow with any European power, and if that power succeeded in closing our ports, to say nothing of menacing the security of our cities, the stream of food supplies essential to the very existence of every other country, would be dammed up, and every neutral power would find itself forced by imperious necessity to interfere for the purpose of liberating that stream of supplies, of which this bountiful soil of ours is an exhaustless fountain when cultivated by the matchless productive energies of our people. And so, Mr. Chairman, I dismiss utterly and completely the possibility of attack on our Atlantic coast line from any source. But on the Pacific I discern a danger, and a serious one, which we can not afford to disregard. The gentleman from Ohio has himself described

conditions that establish beyond all question the existence of a peril against which, it seems to me, we are bound to take precautions in the discharge of our plain duty, not alone toward our own country, but to the civilization of which this country is the depository and the trustee.

The gentleman says there has been a remarkable growth of racial repulsion during the last few years. I do not admit there has been a growth of racial repulsion, because I believe it is impossible for that repulsion either to grow or diminish. It is inherent, irrepressible, unconquerable in all men—sometimes smoldering when races are far apart, leaping into life and activity instantaneously and instinctively the moment they come in contact. Never yet have two races dwelt together peaceably in actual contact, except where one has consented to admit superiority of the other. [Applause.] To this fact all history bears unbroken testimony. Gentlemen on this side of the Chamber, you have had demonstrated by experience—ample, recent, and bitter—the truth of this proposition in the South. Within a few years an attempt was made by constitutional provision to establish two races on conditions politically equal in your own States. What was the result? One race immediately asserted its superiority over the other. No power could prevent that assertion or withstand its success. Every resource this great Government could exercise was invoked, and all of them proved unable to establish equality between these two races. Your state governments were in the possession of the race which you consider inferior.

The National Government, with its army, its Congress, by overwhelming votes of both Houses, exhausted all the powers of civilized society in an effort to maintain the inferior race in possession of the governments they had seized, and all the efforts of both governments, state and national, failed absolutely. [Applause.] While the attempts to maintain equality continued, nothing but confusion and disturbance resulted. [Renewed applause.] The two races to-day dwell together in peace with each other, and there is every prospect of peace throughout the future, because the condition of contact between them now is that one race, in act if not in word, acknowledges inferiority.

But there are on the Pacific coast to-day two distinct races, one of which will not acknowledge inferiority, and the other will not acknowledge equality. One has held the soil for many years. The other has but recently appeared on it. This last race has grown greatly during the last few years, not only in numbers, but in possessions. Everybody concedes that if this growth should continue nothing can prevent our fellow-citizens on the Pacific coast from taking measures to exclude all members of this alien race. Whether this determination be commendable or otherwise is not worth discussing. It is inexorable. The President of the United States is now negotiating to secure their exclusion by voluntary cooperation of the Japanese Government. Whether his efforts will prevail or not we do not know. There is, however, one fact of great significance which we can not escape. The Japanese Government will not consent to a treaty providing for exclusion. If therefore the measures taken by their own Government to prevent Japanese coolies from coming here should not prove effective, then nothing will be left but passage by Congress of an exclusion act. Such an act would be demanded by a public sentiment so overwhelming that it could not be resisted. Everyone knows that passage by the country of an exclusion law would be considered an act of unfriendliness by the Japanese Government. Diplomatic relations with us would very likely, almost certainly, be broken off. Will any gentleman here question that fact? Gentlemen know what followed in another part of the world when that same Government broke off diplomatic relations with a great European power. But, Mr. Chairman, even under such conditions, I do not believe the Japanese Government would make war upon us.

So far as that Government is concerned I believe it would confine its manifestation of resentment or displeasure to a mere suspension of diplomatic intercourse.

If war should come, I repeat, it will come not through the desire of either Government to make it but in spite of everything both Governments can do to prevent it.

And I can conceive circumstances under which both Governments would be powerless to avert war. Suppose that racial antipathy, which is unconquerable, should, under the stress of some sudden excitement, take the form in California which it actually took in New Orleans a few years ago. Suppose that for some reason or other there was an outburst of racial hostility, in the course of which a number of Japanese were lynched on the Pacific coast. Do you think the Japanese in Tokyo or Nagasaki would allow it to pass without reprisal? If you do, you have never visited that country. Their pride of race

is even more intense than ours. We have other passionate attachments besides our patriotic impulses.

With us love of family, love of children, love of parents, love of friends are strong as love of country. The Japanese appear to have but one absorbing passion, and that is love of country; one universal impulse, and that is pride of race. Let that be outraged and reprisals would follow inevitably as night the day. What form would they take? That question is not difficult to answer. In this country if any Japanese were lynched they would be laborers. There are no American laborers that could be lynched in Japan. In that country there are American merchants, American missionaries, American tourists, American officials. Picture to yourselves a contingency that is entirely possible—conceive not a condition which is unprecedented or wildly improbable, but the recurrence of a condition which has already happened. Suppose that, as a number of Italians were lynched in New Orleans some years ago, a number of Japanese should be similarly done to death in California or Oregon, and that the lynching of these Japanese laborers were followed by lynching of Americans belonging to a superior class in Tokyo. Do you believe it would be possible to prevent an ebullition of feeling in this country that would hurry us irresistibly into hostilities? Would you gentlemen who propose to vote against this measure of precaution now, if an American consul were lynched in Tokyo, or a number of American missionaries were massacred in some other part of Japan—even under the provocation of prior lynchings by Americans—would you come in here to counsel peace and submission? It would be excellent counsel, but it would fall upon deaf ears.

There is but one way to make peace secure against resentments provoked by acts of violence perpetrated in either country on citizens of the other, and that is by making the force at the disposal of one so decisively preponderant that the hopelessness of attacking it or its citizens will be obvious and unmistakable.

I would not be understood as defending, excusing, or palliating acts of violence by citizens of this country or any other. I am merely describing conditions which I believe to be actual, and urging measures to avert dangers which I believe to be serious and portentous.

Now, sir, I know it is suggested that even if these two battle ships are voted, they can not be constructed in time to meet an immediate emergency. But, sir, the necessity for building them remains. One difficulty with this peril is that it is continuous. Our precautions must therefore be continuous. This peril can not be averted by negotiations begun or terminated in a year. It will last until all, practically, members of that race whose advent has provoked it shall have disappeared from our shores, and there is no prospect of their speedy disappearance. Even the negotiations undertaken by the President aim at gradual, not at immediate, exclusion. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

MR. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois how many more speakers he has on his side? MR. FOSS. I think only one more.

MR. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COCKRAN], and I feel compelled to say in reply that he is extravagant in suppositions. Peace and war in this day, are not made as they were generations and centuries ago. To-day they are made in the counting houses of New York, London, Berlin, and Paris. What informed man in this country does not know that the peace of Portsmouth would not have been made had Japan been able to procure the sinews of war? It is a fact that she was compelled to accede to peace with Russia because she had exhausted her resources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to no man, I hope, in patriotism and love of country. I do not speak as a southern man at all. I speak as an American citizen. And no one will go further than I to uphold the honor and the glory of this country; but I do not believe that it is necessary at this time to authorize the building of two additional battle ships, at a cost of \$25,000,000. And why? To-day we have six battle ships building.

I may say, not in a spirit of unfriendly criticism, that it takes entirely too long to build a battle ship in this country—nearly or quite three and one-half years. In other countries one-half of this time is sufficient. Take the strength of the United States Navy to-day, and, practically speaking, it is second to the naval strength of England. Another consideration, Mr. Chairman: In ten years a battle ship is obsolete and out of date. The battle ship *Oregon* of ten years ago is to-day practically worthless as an engine of destruction. Yes, the building of battle ships by this country more than we have is unnecessary. Battle ships are for aggression. I believe that the provisions in this bill for torpedo boats, torpedo-boat destroyers, and so on, engines for defense, should be the policy for us to pursue at this time. It has been said that we must prepare for war.

What nation would send its fleet to the coast of America? Would they not be met at the entrance of every harbor in this country by submarine and torpedo boats, and would not their ships be destroyed? And if worst came to worst, we would send for the Wright brothers to come home. The time has come when navigation of the air is in order.

I believe that voting out the provision in this bill for the construction of two more battle ships by the United States Government will make for the peace so much sought after by The Hague peace conference. When that conference meets again, it will not be met with the universal cry, truthfully made before, that while the nations of the world are crying peace they are preparing for war, each and every one of them all that it is able.

So, Mr. Chairman, the construction of two battle ships not being necessary now on the ground of public policy or necessity, I have offered the amendment in good faith; and I will say that in the ten years I have been in Congress I have believed in submarines and torpedo boats and engines of defense, and this country is equipped to-day. I do not believe that any enemy could come here, or if they did come, would remain very long with a flag hostile to us floating over them. [Applause.] In extending my remarks I will insert the following:

The following statement of reasons why our navy should not be enlarged is issued with the indorsement of a large body of the leading men of the country, including Charles Francis Adams, Jane Addams, Samuel Bowles, John Graham Brooks, Andrew Carnegie, James Duncan, President Faunce, of Brown University, A. B. Farquhar, Edwin Ginn, Washington Gladden, Edward Everett Hale, William D. Howells, Chester Holcombe, Prof. William James, Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, President Jordan, of Leland Stanford University, Bishop William N. McVicker, Marcus Marks, N. O. Nelson, Gen. William J. Palmer, Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, George Foster Peabody, Bliss Perry, Dean Henry Wade Rogers, of the Yale Law School, Prof. William G. Sumner, Lincoln Steffens, Ida M. Tarbell, President Thwing, of Western Reserve University, President Thompson of the State University of Ohio, Booker T. Washington, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, President Mary E. Woolley, of Mount Holyoke College, and others:

1. Because we have fought foreign foes, English, Spanish, and Mexican, only six years in the one hundred and twenty-five years since the Revolution. In every foreign war we made the first attack. With less danger from attack than any other nation, we are now spending more for past war and preparation for future war than any other nation in the world.

2. Because our extent of coast line has little relation to danger from attack. The Second Hague Conference has provided for immunity from bombardment of all unfortified towns and from levying contributions by threat of bombardment.

3. Because the Hague conference also provided for arbitration of disputes over contractual debts, thereby removing excuse for our keeping a navy to prevent forcible collection of such debts of South America to Europe.

4. Because a navy is less needed than ever to protect South America, as it is now perfectly capable of a defensive alliance among its nations to repel any wanton attack from outside. Reasons which made the Monroe doctrine necessary when there was a "Holy Alliance" and the weak South American republics were unconnected by telegraphs or railroads have no application when modern communications, soon to include the Panama Canal, and enormously increased population, wealth, and mutual friendship make them now far from eager to continue our overlordship. With the price of a few torpedo boats we might secure by education and diplomacy a federation of South American States.

5. Because there is no danger from China, a peace-loving nation friendly to us. Our return of the indemnity has done more to promote peace with her than anything else could do. According to the testimony of Ambassador Luke Wright, of Hon. John W. Foster, of Secretary Taft, and of over 100 missionaries to Japan, familiar with her language, customs, and politics, there is not the slightest foundation for the violent and frothy talk which is emanating from a few Americans against Japan and is poisoning the minds of millions of our uninformed citizens. Said Ambassador Wright: "The talk of war between this country and Japan isn't even respectable nonsense." The 100 missionaries say: "We desire to place on record our profound appreciation of the kind treatment which we experience at the hands of both Government and people. Our belief is that the alleged belligerent attitude of the Japanese does not represent the real sentiments of the people. We wish to bear testimony to the sobriety, sense of international justice, and freedom from aggressive designs exhibited by the great majority of the Japanese people." Nothing could do more to develop the opposite feeling than the baseless assumption and insulting statements published by certain irresponsible newspapers and military men.

6. Because of an excessive, unhealthy reliance on force in our country in recent years, which calls attention away from the real foes at home to supposititious foreign enemies. Its spirit fills the newspapers with reckless, unfounded suspicions and accusations, distorting historic statements, promotes constant talk about war and preparation for war, of maneuvers, promotions, and technical details, and makes us blind to the real sources of our greatest loss of life and property.

7. Because our three foreign wars since 1781, which lasted only six years, cost in life, all told, in battle, nothing comparable with our reckless slaughter by accidents every year in time of peace. The \$60,000,000 increase of the navy asked for last year, if spent in fighting disease, ignorance, waste, and wickedness at home, probably could save as much life and property as all our foreign and civil wars have cost. In five years we have lost alone by fire, largely preventable, \$1,200,000,000. In four years we have killed, by accident, largely preventable, 80,000 more than were killed on both sides in the four years of civil war.

8. Because we are already spending over 65 per cent of the Nation's revenue in payment for past war and in preparation for future war and have but one-third of our national revenue left for judicial and executive departments, coast guard, light-houses, quarantine, custom-houses, post-offices, census, waterways, forestry, consular and diplomatic service, and all other constructive work.

9. Because we have increased our expenditure for defense 200 times during a period when our population has increased only 22 times, our coast line perhaps 3 times, and our danger from attack not at all.

10. Because we are protected by nature as is no other country and have not the excuse for a great navy which England has nor for a strong army which Germany has. Our wealth is as great a protection as our geographical position. We supply our own necessities and are not dependent, as many nations are. General Sheridan said that no nation on the continent of Europe had sufficient ships to spare to bring over enough soldiers to carry on one campaign so far from its base of supplies.

11. Because we shall need no navy to protect the Philippines if we but ask the nations to pledge preservation of their autonomy when we grant them their independence. No nation could refuse or would dare wantonly break such a pledge made to the world. The neutralization, in this manner, of exposed places is one of the most successful methods of preventing war which we can further use. The pledge between the United States and Great Britain to remove battle ships and forts from our Canadian border has, since 1817, secured peace at no expense on over 3,000 miles of frontier. Without this pledge we should probably have had war. So long as this line is unguarded we shall never fight Great Britain.

12. Because all the great nations, in one place or another, are securing safety from territorial aggrandizement by pledging territorial inviolability. All the nations on the Baltic and North seas signed treaties in April, 1908, to respect each other's territory on those waters. Turbulent Central America has secured peace by similar methods. It is the method of the future.

13. Because, in spite of our strategic position and the fact that Europe largely depends on us for food, we are spending for defense more than France and only \$36,000,000 less than Germany and only \$66,000,000 less than Great Britain, which has possessions to protect around the globe and is unable to feed herself except by imports.

14. Because labor put into the construction of armaments could be better employed to increase our insufficient railroad capacity, and as many men could be employed in making rails and engines, of which we have too few to move our crops, as in making armor plate and instruments of destruction.

15. Because the recent arbitration treaties signed with Great Britain, France, Norway, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Japan, and Germany minimize the possibility of war with those countries, and we have no fear of any others.

16. Because, as was unanimously agreed at the arbitration conference in 1904, in Washington, attended by a great body of our most eminent public men, there is no question of "honor" or "vital interest" which can not be arbitrated, except, of course, that of autonomy, which can be secured by international pledge, and in our case is beyond menace. Some of the smaller nations have already agreed to arbitrate every question. There is no excuse for increased armaments until we have at least tried to get the great powers to pledge themselves to arbitrate every question with us.

17. Because we can secure far greater safety by expending on a peace budget a small amount every year—say one dollar out of every thousand voted for armaments. This method was recommended by the Interparliamentary Union and is worth more even than the ounce of prevention, which is worth a pound of cure. Courtesy and good will are more powerful than explosives in preventing war.

18. Because a national arrogance is growing in our country; and bumptious talk about our being "master of the Pacific," though there are ten other nations bordering on it, is leading a part of our press and people to insult and irritate other people with the sense of impunity in our impudence which a huge navy lends. We, as well as other nations, have found easy euphemisms to ease our consciences when using our military power to further our own ends. We shall be far less likely to be hotheaded and rash and to rush into needless war if we do not increase our navy. It is naive conceit to say that we are so peaceful and just that we can never be tempted to wage a needless war.

Said Secretary of State Sherman concerning the Spanish war: "We could have adjusted our difficulties without the loss of blood and treasure." Said Congressman Boutelle: "President McKinley, if Congress had left the matter to him, would have secured everything we wanted in Cuba without the sacrifice of one drop of American or Spanish blood."

19. Because our navy is already so large as to incite other nations to increase theirs. Our naval increase was quoted last year in the French Assembly as an argument for a French increase. This senseless rivalry is driving certain would-be customers of ours toward bankruptcy.

20. Because increase of our navy does not increase respect of foreigners for us. Respect can be given only to moral qualities. Our indifference to lawlessness and our civic corruption are well known abroad. We have no more moral influence than we had thirty years ago, when every monarchy in Europe was being sapped by our democracy. Plutocracy and militarism make us talked of and dreaded, but not respected. Many, perhaps, are glad that we are being hampered in our race for commercial supremacy by saddling ourselves with the Old World's military burdens.

21. Because our dignity no more depends on battle ships than upon light-houses or fire engines. We should feel pride if we are safe enough to dispense with a few. A European city built of stone rejoices that it does not need our costly fire apparatus. A large navy is a confession of conscious weakness or timidity.

22. Because increase of the navy is an implication that new dangers are in sight and old friends are to be suspected. It arouses rivalry and irritation with other nations. The two nations to-day who are the most armed are in the most danger of fighting. Just as Germany's and England's increase of naval power mutually irritates each other, so Japan's military skill has stirred the emulation of our jingoes, masking themselves under the concealed plea that we are par excellence the peaceful people of the world and can do no wrong with our navy.

23. Because "a decent respect for the opinion of mankind" ought to be more and more the controlling motive of nations as of individuals. A navy is but a small element in our defense even from foreign foes, to say nothing of defense from our far greater domestic dangers to life and property. We have been secure from attack with our fleet at the antipodes.

24. Because the demand for it comes chiefly from those who ignore the new substitutes for war and whose military training fits them only to kill enemies, but not to prevent friends becoming enemies. They understand explosives, but not human nature or politics or diplomacy or the methods which have produced the astounding bloodless revolution in Turkey; or the demand comes from the class which supplies im-

plements of war and surreptitiously keeps up war scares which the gullible voters make profitable to them.

25. Because declaration of nonintercourse embodied in treaties is a feasible and far more powerful force. We would better spend our energy in studying this new agent, advocated by Justice Brewer, of the Supreme Court, and other able men, now made possible by modern conditions of communication and politics. If one fifth of the \$60,000,000 asked for were spent on an educational campaign for a pledge of nonintercourse from England, France, and the United States against any nation which attacked one of them and refused to arbitrate, it would do more to keep the world's peace than all their navies. Were two of these strong nations previously to make public their signed agreements to withdraw diplomats and stop commerce upon wanton attack on the third power, no nation would ever attack the third. The declaration would suffice. This is a totally different thing from the old-fashioned embargo declared by one nation on another after war began. Even the unorganized Chinese boycotts, not backed by the Chinese Government, made us remove injustices and more recently coerced Japan. If in fifteen years 400,000,000 organized Chinese refuse to buy goods if they are ill treated, the greatest navies will avail nothing to get their markets.

26. Because new inventions in all probability will make existing armaments useless before Japan, even if she wanted to attack us, could recuperate from her financial drain sufficiently to do so. Airships may make battle ships useless.

27. Because an increase of the navy argues infidelity to the great achievements of The Hague conventions. It is childish inconsistent to create more force when better methods are being substituted for it.

28. Because every enlargement of the navy draws men from constructive work. It keeps them always on the outlook for the trouble which alone could give them the sense of being of real service and importance and getting promotions and honors. Advocates of large navies are notably skeptical about other methods than force for promoting peace and draw the attention of the public away from the quiet and effective to the old-fashioned methods which tickle eye and ear with noisy and spectacular effects.

29. Because by lowering excessive tariffs and thus promoting commercial fraternity we could do more for peace than through intimidation by armaments.

30. Because we have not the faintest ground to suspect there will ever be a war again with England so long as our northern frontier is free from her fortifications; nor with Spain, whose interests hereafter can not cross ours; nor with any of the other nations with whom we have always been at peace and who could fight us only at a range of thousands of miles from their base of supplies. We are especially secure, as Europe is dependent on us for a large share of her food supply, and the Orient has everything to lose and nothing to gain by attacking us. The "yellow peril" is a psychological obsession of a few scare-mongers \* \* \* that would excuse their cry for an increased navy.

JANUARY 15, 1909.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, the question before the House is this: The gentleman moves to strike out the authorization of two battle ships recommended by the committee to this House, and if this is stricken out there will be no battle ships authorized this year. I wish to say to this committee that the Naval Committee in its recommendation was not moved by any war scare. It did not believe that we would have war with any country, but it has recommended two battle ships instead of four battle ships, as recommended by the general board and the Secretary of the Navy, and also the President of the United States, in consideration of the fact that we believe that the people of this country were in favor of maintaining our navy on an efficient basis; and in order to keep our navy up to the standard of efficiency such as we have to-day it would be necessary for us to authorize two ships.

Another thing, the programme which was presented to the Naval Committee by the Secretary of the Navy would have cost in the neighborhood of \$70,000,000, but this programme recommended by the Naval Committee will cost only about \$27,000,000, less than one-half. From these facts you will see that our committee, in its recommendation, has been reasonably fair and sensible, and not moved by any of the mysterious sentiment floating about that we are on the verge of war.

I sympathize with a great deal that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has said. I would like to see that bright dream of Tennyson's realized—

When the war drums shall beat no longer,  
And the battle flags shall be furled.

But we have not reached that stage of perfection yet; we have not reached that stage of perfect liberty yet; we have not reached that stage of enlightenment wherein the gentleman of Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] has said the greatest defense of the country will be the enlightenment of mankind. We must legislate here as we find people are, and not as we hope they will be some day. We must legislate as nations are and as nations exist to-day, and not as they may be in the far-off future.

Mankind has been a proper all the way along the pathway of human liberty, trying to reach the highest stage of perfection. But it behooves us, as practical legislators, to-day to view nations and people as we find them, and to legislate on that basis.

Now, we have, as a Nation, great interests which need protection. We have interests upon this hemisphere; we have not only the defense of our own coast line, but the defense of the

great canal which we are building, and we have also the maintenance of the Monroe doctrine to uphold. We have also interests upon the other hemisphere which we are bound, as a Nation, to protect and defend. We hold the Philippine Islands, and yet it was only a few years ago when the distinguished Admiral of our Navy, appearing before the Naval Committee, said that we could not hold those islands for six weeks if it were not for the American Navy.

So I say to you here and now, in view of these facts, if we have these mighty interests to protect and defend, it behooves this committee to vote for at least two battle ships in order to keep and maintain our navy up to the splendid high state of efficiency which it enjoys to-day, and I trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina will be voted down. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on this paragraph has expired.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment by way of a substitute, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by substituting:

"One first-class battle ship, to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not exceeding \$6,000,000, similar in all essential characteristics to the battle ships in the act making appropriation for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908."

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I suppose, from a parliamentary standpoint that amendment is in order, although there may be some question in regard to that. Really the present amendment should be voted upon first, and then, if the gentleman desires to present that as a substitute, he can do so. I trust he will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the substitute is in order first.

Mr. MACON. The substitute, as I understand it, is in order now. We have been told many times upon this floor that legislation was a matter of compromise—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is out of order.

Mr. MACON. And this seems to be a compromise between two battle ships and none.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] offered an amendment to strike out all of the paragraph under consideration after certain words named in the paragraph. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] offers an amendment as stated by him by way of substitute, which amendment, however, is designed to perfect the paragraph in the bill. Under the well-recognized principles of parliamentary law a motion to protect the text of the bill is to be voted upon before the motion to strike out. The question is, therefore, on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

There was no objection, and the amendment was again reported by the Clerk.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINLEY) there were—ayes 80, noes 160.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 59, line 7, strike out "two" and insert "one;" also substitute "ship" for "ships;" also, in line 9, strike out the word "each."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, against that amendment I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. The point of order is this: That on this proposition, as near as I can hear the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, the committee has already passed in voting upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be that the amendment is in effect the same, but the amendment in form is different, and it is not for the Chair, the Chair thinks, to determine the effect of the amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Without objection, on the request of Mr. COCKRAN, the amendment was again repeated.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURTON of Ohio) there were—ayes 108, noes 174.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. BURTON of Ohio and Mr. Foss.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 108, noes 158.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.  
The Clerk read as follows:

Five torpedo-boat destroyers, to have the highest practicable speed, and to cost, exclusive of armament, not to exceed \$800,000 each.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, strike out all of lines 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I have read a great deal about torpedo-boat destroyers, but I have never yet read or heard of any useful thing that they have done in connection with any of the naval contests of the world. I believe that the appropriation for two battle ships at this time will satisfy the demands of the people for an increase of the navy. I think it will serve every purpose that could be considered necessary to the perfection of an efficient navy. I do not believe that these torpedo-boat destroyers, five in number, are necessary, and I think it therefore an unnecessary expenditure of \$800,000 at this time. A few moments ago I offered an amendment providing for the construction of one battle ship instead of two. I did that as a matter of compromise, understanding that all legislation had here is a matter of compromise. I believe that the American people want something done in the way of an appropriation for the further construction or extension of the navy each year. My amendment being voted down, I then voted for the construction of two, as recommended by the committee, feeling that the American people demand that something be done in behalf of the increase of the navy. But now that the House has appropriated for two large battle ships, I do not deem it wise to further prosecute the matter at this time by appropriating \$800,000 for a lot of torpedo-boat destroyers, which, as stated a while ago, I have failed as yet to hear of ever having accomplished anything great in naval warfare.

Therefore, I hope the amendment will prevail. Nobody is afraid of Japan that I know of in this country, Mr. Chairman. There is no more opportunity for Japan to vanquish the American people, either upon land or upon sea, than there is for an inferior race in the southern clime of this Nation to overcome the proud Caucasian race that dominates it now and will forever do so.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's proposition is to strike out the five torpedo-boat destroyers recommended by the committee. I want to state that in the recommendation made by the General Board, the Secretary of the Navy, and the President there was recommended ten torpedo-boat destroyers, but the committee have only recommended five in this bill. They are very important craft and are used as scouts in attacking a vessel. It is a very serviceable boat, indeed, and inasmuch as we are asking for a few of them, a reasonable number, and in view of the fact we are deficient in these torpedo-boat destroyers, I trust that this committee will vote down the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. MACON. Can the gentleman tell me where a torpedo-boat destroyer has ever taken any effective part in a naval engagement?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; in the Japan-Russian war.

Mr. MACON. Oh, that has been exploded. The newspapers said a torpedo boat had something to do with that battle, but afterwards that was exploded in a subsequent report.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to contract for or purchase one destroyer whose vitals are located below the normal load water line, such vessel to cost not to exceed \$400,000 and to have a speed not less than 22 knots; also two small vessels of similar construction having a speed of not less than 16 knots and to cost not to exceed \$22,500 each: *Provided*, That before any vessel provided for in this paragraph shall be purchased or contracted for a vessel of similar construction shall have been constructed complete and of full size for naval warfare and submitted to the Navy Department for such trial and tests as the Secretary of the Navy may, in his discretion, prescribe, and as the result of such tests be demonstrated to have fulfilled all the reasonable requirements of naval warfare for such a vessel.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I would like to ascertain

from some member of the committee whether there has been any recommendation by the naval board for the construction of destroyers of the type provided for in this section?

Mr. FOSS. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. I fail to find any such recommendation in my reading of their report, and I did not know whether there was any outside recommendation.

Mr. FOSS. This was not recommended by the Navy Department, but I think they would like very much to have such a boat built.

Mr. STAFFORD. On what basis does the chairman of the committee come to such conclusion if they have not recommended it in their report here and there is no recommendation whatever to the committee in writing?

Mr. FOSS. The gentleman will notice the language here. It is that the company build one boat and submit it to certain tests, and in case it comes up to those tests the Navy Department will buy the craft.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has not answered the query propounded to him. Upon whose recommendation has this proposal been included in the bill? He said it is not the recommendation of the Navy Department, nor is it contained in the recommendations of the naval board. Is it merely an idea of some outsider, or some member of the committee, or upon whose request has this action been taken?

Mr. FOSS. There was a member of the committee who was very desirous that this should go into the bill, I will say to the gentleman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobson].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can give the gentleman a little light on the proposition. I think it was a year ago that the committee gave a hearing to people interested in the construction of this particular type of torpedo-boat destroyer, and as a result of that hearing the committee incorporated in last year's bill a provision, if my memory serves, for three boats of this type. That went out on a point of order. One member of our committee, who was interested in the proposition last year, was also interested this year, and, if I am correctly informed, it was upon his request that the proviso was again inserted in the bill. It is thought this is a solution of the torpedo-boat destroyer question. If the proposition becomes a law and if the people who build the boat of this type construct one which meets with the requirements of the Navy Department, the Navy Department may then purchase it. If it does not meet the requirements, they are under no obligation to purchase, and the Government is not put to any expense whatever. That is all the light I think any members of our committee can throw on this proposition. The clerk of the committee informs me that it was in evidence that a model of this type of boat had been successfully tested.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I question very much whether, in the existing condition of the government's finances, it is a proper time to launch upon any experimentation in new types of torpedo destroyers. Certainly we should not adopt as a part of the naval bill provisions for untried destroyers without having the recommendation of any person whatsoever connected with the Navy Department. Many of the recommendations of this naval board have been passed over by the committee, such as scout cruisers and other character of fighting force, and I feel compelled under existing circumstances to make the point of order against the paragraph for the reason that it is new legislation and in violation of paragraph 2 of Rule XXI. This same provision was passed upon last year when the matter was under consideration by the committee, and was then ruled out of order. I call the attention of the Chairman to the ruling in a similar matter on page 4828 of the Record of the first session of this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One fleet collier, of 14 knots trial speed, when carrying not less than 12,500 tons of cargo and bunker coal, to cost not exceeding \$1,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I understand it, this section must be considered in connection with the section following, which seeks to alter existing law by—

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. This has nothing to do with that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recognize it is a separate provision, but in the decision of this question must you not also consider the effect of the following section, whereby you make available the amount of money that was last year provided for two fleet colliers so that you may purchase four?

Mr. FOSS. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the recommendation of the naval board, they request three additional fleet colliers, and in this paragraph you make provision for one of those, and in the next paragraph you seek to make provision for the additional two by making applicable the money that was voted last year for two, so as to construct four by reason of the low bids that were offered by private concerns.

Mr. FOSS. This fleet collier that we recommend here has no relation to the other four whatever.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not the committee be somewhat swayed in their determination of this question if they knew the following paragraph would be in order whereby two additional fleet colliers would be provided, whereas this paragraph would provide, in addition, a third one?

Mr. FOSS. I do not think it would operate to change the committee's mind at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask whether the committee does not recommend in effect three additional fleet colliers of the same type that is provided in the paragraph under consideration?

Mr. FOSS. The committee recommend one fleet collier, and then it recommends that out of the money authorized last year, and to be authorized for the two fleet colliers which were authorized last year, that that appropriation be used to purchase four colliers by private contract at the same price.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the committee, in effect, recommends the addition to our naval fleet of three fleet colliers?

Mr. FOSS. It recommends the addition of two fleet colliers without an additional appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am dismissing entirely the question of the appropriation, for in the determination of the size of our fleet we are not guided entirely by appropriation, but more by the needs of the service, and the naval board has recommended, as I understand the recommendation of the naval board, three fleet colliers. I understand the chairman of the committee to admit now that the committee recommends the addition of three fleet colliers to those already authorized in the present paragraph and that which follows.

Mr. FOSS. There is no dispute on that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood at the beginning that the gentleman took issue with that statement. The board recommended three colliers in all, and appropriation in this paragraph is made for one.

Mr. FOSS. Because on the concession of last year there is enough to buy two colliers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am quite well acquainted with the argument and the reasons that induced the committee to provide for four colliers in place of two authorized last year, and the committee has recommended three colliers instead of one.

Mr. DAWSON. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin assume that three is too many?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am trying to ascertain whether, if the increase in the next paragraph is stricken out, the committee would not recommend, as it does in fact, three fleet colliers; and if it does, this matter should be taken into consideration on the pending paragraph of whether we should recommend one collier. This paragraph should be taken in consideration with the recommendation following in the next paragraph providing for two additional fleet colliers. I therefore believe that the two are inseparably connected, and I move that the present paragraph be considered in connection with the paragraph which follows.

Mr. FOSS. I hope that will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 60, line 10, strike out "one million" and insert "nine hundred thousand."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to a very remarkable condition. Last year the committee reported in favor of building two fleet colliers similar in every respect to the one authorized in this paragraph. It placed a limit of cost upon these two fleet colliers of \$1,800,000 each. The committee did that, I assume, upon information furnished to it that the cost of these colliers would be about \$1,800,000. When the bill came into the House, the House, in Committee of the Whole, provided that one of these colliers should be built in a government navy-yard, and that provision was finally incorporated into the law. As soon

as it was ascertained that one of these vessels would be built by a government navy-yard, the private contractors offered to construct either two or four of these vessels, not at the price, or near the price, fixed in the bill, but for one-half the limit of cost placed upon these vessels by the committee. If it be possible to obtain two of these vessels for \$900,000 each, or four of them for \$900,000 each, perhaps members of the Naval Committee will explain why they placed a limit of cost upon this particular vessel of \$100,000 in excess of what they know they can get a contract?

These patriotic shipbuilding concerns of the United States, cooperating with some well-informed officials in the Navy Department, were willing to build these ships at a cost of about \$1,800,000. If they can take this one ship placed for construction at a government yard out of the government yard, they will build four of them for \$900,000 apiece. For the additional ship they want an extra \$100,000. It seems to me that if they can build four of these ships for \$900,000 each, they should build five of them for \$900,000 each. If they can build two ships, authorized last session, for \$900,000 each, they can build one ship authorized last year, and this particular ship in addition, for \$900,000 each. This seems to be a clear invitation to the shipbuilders and to the department to waste—oh, not exactly to waste but to donate \$100,000 to some particular concern for doing work for a million dollars, when it has already been disclosed that it can be had for \$900,000. In view of these facts, I hope the committee will adopt this amendment and put a limitation of cost upon this particular vessel of \$900,000.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman allow me to ask whether or not it is a fact that one of these colliers is now being constructed for something like \$825,000?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not the figures. I do not know what the bid was, but I understand that these shipbuilding plants are willing to build two for \$1,800,000, both authorized last year, and they want to get something additional for the one authorized this year. In view of this showing that they can build for \$900,000, it is inconceivable to imagine upon what theory the committee increased the limit of cost, except its extreme solicitude for the poor persons engaged in the business of building ships for the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, because I believe these colliers can be built a great deal cheaper than proposed in this bill. When we had a hearing before the Committee on Merchant Marine, a gentleman who appeared there stated, I think, that they had a contract to build one of these colliers, and that they had taken the contract, if I remember correctly—and I have no desire to misquote the gentleman's statement—for \$825,000.

Now, it strikes me that if a private contractor has agreed to build the collier in question for \$805,000 (and that was the statement made by the gentleman who represents one of the private shipbuilding concerns in the United States, made before the Merchant Marine Committee), we are paying too much for the construction of these colliers.

Mr. BATES. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. You say we appropriated \$1,800,000 last year.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; we appropriated \$1,500,000 on account of two ships, but the cost limit of each ship was placed at \$1,800,000.

Mr. BATES. But we did not spend it, did we?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; but it would have been spent if the House had not put in the provision for navy-yard competition that it did.

Mr. TALBOTT. The one being built in the navy-yard cost \$800,000 more than the one being built under private contract.

Mr. FITZGERALD. In my opinion, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I have here a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, written on the 18th of January, in which he says:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 18, 1909.

SIR: In compliance with your request by telephone to-day, I transmit herewith for your information a copy of the schedule of bids received for the construction by contract of one of the colliers authorized by the naval appropriation act of May 13, 1908, together with a copy of the form of proposal issued by the department and used by the bidders.

Very respectfully,

TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY,  
Secretary.

Hon. GEO. EDMUND FOSS,  
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,  
House of Representatives.

The bids referred to are as follows.

Proposals for the construction of a steel steam collier. No. 4. "Cyclops."  
Advertisement dated October 9, 1908. Bids opened December 15, 1908.

Name of bidder.	Price.	Remarks.
Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va.	\$790,000	Bid 1. Vessel to be completed within 16 months. Certified check, \$36,000. Contemplates that department use designs of bidder in building collier on Pacific coast, with no extra charge on account of patented invention.
	825,000	Bid 2. To be completed within 16 months. (Check with previous bid.)
Fore River Shipbuilding Co., Quincy, Mass.	933,000	Bid 1. Vessel to be completed within 15 months. (As per specifications, p. 48, par. 182.) Certified check, \$36,000.
	954,000	Bid 2. To be completed within 15 months. (As per specifications, p. 48, par. 182.) (Check with previous bid.)
New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J.	1,074,000	Vessel to be completed within 15 months. Proposal for supplying Lidgerwood coaling apparatus, \$30,000 additional.
Maryland Steel Co., Sparrows Point, Md.	993,800	Bond for \$36,000. Class 1. Vessel to be completed within 16 months.
	1,011,400	Bond for \$36,000. Class 2. To be completed within 16 months.
	1,027,850	Class 3. To be completed within 16 months.
The William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	805,000	Bid 1. Vessel to be completed within 20 months. Bond for \$36,000.
	775,000	Bid 2. To be completed within 20 months.

Publicly opened at the Navy Department, December 15, 1908, in the presence of the Secretary of the Navy.

PICKENS NEAGLE,  
Law Clerk for Solicitor.

Proposal for the construction of a steel steam collier of about 12,500 tons cargo and bunker capacity.

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, D. C.:

Having carefully examined the circular issued by the Secretary of the Navy under date of October 8, 1908, defining the chief characteristics of a collier to be built by contract for the navy, and the outline type plans mentioned in said circular, the provisions of the acts of Congress quoted in said circular, and the form of contract for the construction of said vessel provided by the Secretary of the Navy, and having received all information in the premises essential to a full understanding of the obligations incurred, or to be incurred, under and by virtue of this proposal, we, \_\_\_\_\_, do hereby propose, under the department's advertisement of October 9, 1908, to construct and complete, within \_\_\_\_\_ months from date of contract, at \_\_\_\_\_, and deliver to the Navy Department, in the manner and upon the terms and conditions stated in said circular and form of contract, a steel collier, including hull, fittings, machinery, outfits, and equipment complete, to be constructed in accordance with the drawings, plans, and specifications and other information herewith submitted, and to have a speed of 14 knots an hour when carrying not less than 12,500 tons of cargo and bunker coal, for the sum of \_\_\_\_\_.

Also, we hereby consent and agree that in the event of the acceptance of the foregoing proposal the Secretary of the Navy may, so far as he desires, use in the construction of a collier at any navy-yard the design and the detailed drawings and specifications of the vessel covered by said proposal without extra compensation in addition to the above-stated price; and in consideration of said sum we further agree to waive compensation in any and every form for the use or adoption of any and all patented features of said design, drawings, and specifications, and to protect and discharge the Government from and against any and every claim for or on account of the use of any and all patented features embodied in the general design of hull and machinery, but not including patented details furnished by subcontractors, such as winches, pumps, steering and anchor engines, etc.

The drawings, plans, and specifications herein designated and the aforesaid circular and form of contract are to be deemed and taken as part of this proposal.

In case this proposal shall be accepted, we hereby agree to enter into contract, within ten days from receipt of notice of such acceptance, for the construction of said vessel, in accordance with said circular, drawings, plans, specifications, form of contract, and this proposal, and within the same period to give bond, with security to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, in a penal sum equal to 15 per cent of the amount of bid for the faithful performance of such contract.

This proposal is accompanied by evidence of our competency to perform the work required and also by a \_\_\_\_\_ for the sum of \_\_\_\_\_ dollars, as required by the instructions to bidders herewith, which \_\_\_\_\_ is hereby declared to be subject to the conditions stated in said instructions.

Witness our hand and seal at \_\_\_\_\_, the \_\_\_\_\_ day of December, 1908.

In presence of—

Insert "bond" or "check," whichever is appropriate.

#### ADVERTISEMENT.

Proposals for constructing by contract one steam collier (fleet collier No. 4, *Cyclops*) will be received at the Navy Department until 12 o'clock noon, December 15, 1908, when they will be publicly opened. Circular defining chief characteristics of such vessel and outline type plans are now ready for distribution among prospective bidders. Forms of proposal and contract may be had on application to the department after November 15.

V. H. METCALF, Secretary.

OCTOBER 9, 1908.

#### INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS.

##### GENERAL PROVISIONS.

The foregoing proposal constitutes an obligation that becomes operative on acceptance. Special care should be taken to avoid any informality that might, by rendering the proposal liable to rejection, tend to the disadvantage of both the bidder and the Government.

Each proposal must include the construction of both vessel and machinery, complete in all respects, and must be accompanied by complete plans and specifications covering fully the design submitted, with full description of all special features and statement as to the registration society under the inspection of which the vessel is to be built.

Contract will be made for the vessel, including hull and machinery. Defective proposals will not be considered unless the Secretary of the Navy shall deem it for the interest of the Government to waive the defect.

Each bidder must submit with his proposals a certified check, payable to the order of the Secretary of the Navy, or a bond, with satisfactory surety or sureties. Such check or bond shall be for the sum of \$36,000. In case the successful bidder shall fail to enter into contract and furnish the requisite security upon the acceptance of his proposal, the certified check submitted with his bid shall become the property of the United States, or in case bond is given the United States may recover as liquidated damages the sum named in such bond. All checks or bonds of bidders whose proposals shall not be accepted will, on the award of the contract, be returned to them, and the check or bond of the successful bidder will be returned to him when his contract shall have been duly entered into and the requisite security furnished.

Proposals must be made in duplicate and will be received until 12 o'clock noon December 15, 1908.

The right is reserved to reject any or all bids as, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the interests of the Government may require.

##### FILLING IN OF BLANKS.

1. Carefully fill in all blank spaces.  
2. In case of proposal by a firm or company not incorporated, the appropriate blank should be filled in a manner corresponding to the following form:

"We, the undersigned, John Doe, of the city of \_\_\_\_\_, County of \_\_\_\_\_, and State of \_\_\_\_\_, and Richard Roe, of the same place (or of \_\_\_\_\_, as the case may be), constituting the firm and doing business at \_\_\_\_\_ under the firm name of John Doe & Co."

The Christian names of individuals should be inserted in full, except that where there is a middle name the initial letter alone of such middle name is sufficient.

3. In case of proposal by an individual, the foregoing directions should be followed as far as applicable, substituting "I" for "we" wherever the latter occurs.

4. In case of proposal by an incorporated company, the same blank should be filled in a manner corresponding to the following form:

"We, the American Iron Company, a corporation created under the laws of the State of \_\_\_\_\_, and doing business at \_\_\_\_\_."

5. The name of the place at which the proposal is signed, as, for instance, "Chester, Pa.," and the date of signing are to be inserted in the blanks left for that purpose.

6. The amount, both in figures and at length, for which it is proposed to do the work, is to be inserted in the appropriate place.

##### MANNER OF SIGNING PROPOSALS.

1. In case of proposal by a firm or company not incorporated, each member of the firm will sign individually with his full name, except that his middle name, if any, may be indicated by initial only or otherwise, according to his customary manner of signing. Each signer will add, below his signature, the place of his residence.

2. In case of proposal by an incorporated company, the same will be signed by the officer who is, by the act of incorporation, the by-laws, or a special resolution of the board of directors or trustees, authorized to sign for the company. In either case a certified copy of the authority must accompany the proposal. The official seal of the company will be placed opposite the signature and attested by the proper officer; and the proposal should be accompanied by suitable evidence of incorporation, which may be either a copy of the act of incorporation, certified under seal by the officer with whom it is filed, or his certificate under seal that such company was on the date mentioned duly incorporated under the general laws of the State in which such company is located.

3. Subscribing witnesses will, when there is more than one signature, add, "Witness as to all the signatures" or "Witness as to the signature of \_\_\_\_\_," giving name of person signing in his presence.

4. When the form of proposal has been properly filled up and signed, it must be forwarded in a sealed envelope, addressed to the "Secretary of the Navy, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.," and indorsed "Proposal for building collier."

Mr. FITZGERALD. On that information, does the gentleman not think \$900,000 is an ample limit of cost? Of course, if it is placed at \$1,000,000, then it will certainly make bids higher; but the gentleman has read several bids of less than \$800,000. Why not keep the limit of cost below \$900,000?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. FOSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from New York has made his motion at this particular point, and has given to the committee his words of wisdom regarding the construction of colliers, if not toward cutting down the amount of the appropriation; for it seems certain that if the members of the committee have read last year's bill they must realize that even an authorization by Congress of \$1,800,000 has not prevented some shipbuilding plants in this

country bidding for the work at less than \$900,000. And I might say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York and of the committee that as one member of the committee I have no objection to making this reduction in the amount authorized.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not believe the gentleman would object.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. The suggestion carries greater weight with it as to the next paragraph, and the question will be put to this House, no doubt, whether its Members are willing to carry out the provisions of the next paragraph, where practically, in substance and effect, if the law of last year is not repealed, we give to some place in this country the benefit of \$900,000 on one collier.

Mr. FOSS. Built in a navy-yard.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. It is a matter that this House should consider well, and I certainly hope that the motion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will be carried unanimously, because that will be an expression that this House does not want ruthlessly to give away the money of the people of the United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as follows: On page 60, line 10, making it \$800,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from New York, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "nine" and insert the word "eight," so that it will read "\$800,000."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Naval Committee, in response to an inquiry, read to the House a letter from the Secretary of the Navy in which was submitted a list of bids under which it was proposed to construct one, two, three, or four colliers at a price as low as \$775,000. In view of the fact that a responsible shipbuilding company is willing to contract to construct these ships at \$775,000 each, there is no justification for an appropriation placing the limit at \$900,000. If the executive officers of the Government are able to secure bids for the construction of ships as low as \$775,000 from reputable, responsible sources, they are in duty bound to accept those bids, and they are also in duty bound to see that the contract is so made as to give the Government ample protection.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. Was the bid of \$775,000 upon plans made by the Government or upon their own plans?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman who represents the Committee on Naval Affairs on the floor of this House did not take the Committee of the Whole House into his confidence, and so I am not able to answer the question of the gentleman from California. I assume that when the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs rises in his place in response to a question and gives information to the House, that he gives that information in good faith; and when he says that the Government is able to secure bids for the construction of certain ships at a given price, the price is satisfactory to the Government. Whether the plans be made by the Navy Department or whether they be made by the men who make the bids makes no difference whatever if what is proposed to be done is the same in each instance. It is our duty to save every dollar we can to the Treasury of the country.

Mr. DAWSON rose.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word.

Mr. DAWSON. Is the gentleman in favor of the proposition?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not know whether I am in favor of the proposition or not. I want a little light.

Mr. DAWSON. I am opposed to it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I would like to ask how much the colliers cost before we began to provide that some of them might be built in the government yards.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It was estimated that they might cost \$1,800,000, but when we provided that one of them might be built in the government yards, then the Government secured bids of less than \$800,000.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that three or four years ago Congress authorized two fleet colliers, the limit of cost being \$1,500,000 each, one to be built in a navy-yard and the other by contract. That was the last action of Congress, except that of last year, and, as we know, nothing has been done under that \$1,800,000 limitation.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Why not?

Mr. ROBERTS. I can not tell you why. I apprehend, however, that the colliers authorized last year with the limit of

cost at \$1,800,000 are colliers of a larger burden and a larger cargo capacity. My recollection is that the *Vestal* and the *Prometheus*, the two colliers I referred to a moment ago, carried a cargo of 5,000 tons. The colliers we authorized last year were to carry about 12,000 tons cargo, a much larger ship, and of course the price is somewhat larger in proportion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the gentleman from Tennessee allow me?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I notice, in reading the testimony of Secretary Newberry, he makes the statement that these colliers are 2 knots slower speed, and consequently have considerably less power and are considerably less expensive. I think that must account for the difference in the cost.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago we began to create competition by allowing a lot of vessels to be built in government yards and others in private yards. The result was, as shown by the gentleman's statement a few minutes ago, that we are getting bids hundreds of thousands of dollars less than we did three or four years ago, before we began that policy.

Now, gentlemen, you are about to turn back to the old policy by permitting the Secretary of the Navy to build all the ships in private yards. If you are going to abandon the wise policy of letting the Government build some of these ships, as in the case of government ammunition and munitions of war, if you abandon the wise policy you adopted, you certainly ought to put in this bill a limitation that the gentleman from New York has proposed, or something of that kind. You ought to do that, so that the Government, so that the Treasury, when it is distressed, as it is, may not be held up later calling for a deficiency to pay for vessels that cost more than is fair and reasonable. The present policy should be pursued. It has done well, as the facts show. We fought long and hard to get this policy started, and I am opposed to stopping.

I call this history to the attention of the committee, and insist, by way of accentuation, that if this policy which we have pursued so wisely for three or four years be abandoned, a limitation had better be put on to keep from being held up by these private concerns.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I am just as anxious as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], both distinguished members of the Committee on Appropriations, to secure these colliers at as reasonable cost as possible; but one fact ought to be taken into account, and that is the testimony which was submitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs, which shows the reason why we are now receiving these exceptionally low bids for the colliers. It was stated before our committee by the Secretary of the Navy himself that, in his judgment, by reason of the present condition in the private shipyards of the United States, these shipyards were bidding for this work not simply at cost, but actually below cost. That being so, we ought to take advantage at this time of present conditions; but I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who has offered the amendment, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who has made an amendment thereto, to the fact that if they are to take advantage of the present low prices in private shipyards, an amendment should be offered to the amendment providing that the money be made immediately available, because—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does he know that there are now pending before one of the committees of this House claims by these shipbuilding concerns aggregating nearly \$4,000,000 to reimburse them for losses they claim they made by taking contracts at a less price than they should have taken them?

Mr. DAWSON. That is not to the point. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that before the Committee on Naval Affairs Mr. Secretary Newberry testified we could get these low figures now, but he had no assurance that he could obtain these low figures on the 1st day of July, when the money in this bill would be available. The committee did not put in a provision making the money immediately available, because we have witnessed the spectacle in this House of one particular committee opposing and raising points of order with regard to that particular provision. If the gentlemen from that committee are sincere in their desire to save the Government a hundred thousand dollars, then I submit that they should add as a part of their amendment another amendment making the appropriation immediately available, in order that the Secretary of the Navy may take advantage of existing conditions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is the gentleman aware of any conditions that now exist or that are likely to arise between now and

the 1st of July that would change the conditions in the ship-building plants of this country, so that they will then be in a position where they will not have to seek this work at a specially low price?

Mr. DAWSON. I can not tell what conditions may arise, but in this particular bill we are proposing to purchase four colliers from private yards.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If we get steel on the free list, that will help them, I think.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman seems to be anxious to save what money can be saved.

Mr. DAWSON. Yes; we are in accord on that.

Mr. MADDEN. Then there ought not to be any objection to the amendments pending before the House if the gentleman is in favor of economy. Why make the argument that these amendments are embarrassing to the department if it is good business policy to economize, in view of the fact that we already have bids for \$775,000 for the construction of each one of these colliers?

Mr. DAWSON. Let me read to the gentleman what the Secretary of the Navy said on that point.

Mr. MADDEN. The point I am referring to is the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, as coming from the Secretary of the Navy, to the effect that bids have been made and are now in his possession offering to construct the ships for \$775,000 each.

Mr. DAWSON. If the gentleman wants me to shed light on the subject, he will first have to turn off his own powerful searchlight.

Mr. MADDEN. I am asking for information which the gentleman possesses.

Mr. DAWSON. I was endeavoring to give it to the gentleman. Secretary Newberry, in his testimony before the committee, stated, speaking of those bids to which the chairman has referred:

I am sure that the highest bidders are very close to cost, and I think the others are below cost.

Mr. MADDEN. On what does he base that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to continue for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman from Iowa know that the representatives of the concern that has that contract for \$805,000 appeared before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries recently and stated that while they had a contract for \$805,000, they were going to lose a great amount of money building that collier, and that they took it simply for the purpose of holding their men together.

Mr. DAWSON. I am not a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, but I would state—

Mr. MADDEN. That is pleading the baby act.

Mr. DAWSON. That the Secretary of the Navy stated substantially the same facts to the Naval Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. As a matter of fact, was there any objection to the Government letting contracts at the lowest price it could get to a responsible concern?

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly not.

Mr. MADDEN. Then why quibble about it.

Mr. DAWSON. If this provision stays in the bill as it is now, without the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Illinois, we will get that very thing, because the Secretary of the Navy has ample discretion. It is not to exceed a million dollars, and I have that faith in the executive officers of the Government that they will obtain the lowest contract possible under existing conditions.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it not a fact the Secretary of the Navy urged the committee to make a limit of cost of these vessels \$1,250,000?

Mr. DAWSON. It is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Then I have very little confidence in his discretion.

Mr. DAWSON. And for the reason I have stated, that if the money is not now immediately available, he can not advertise for bids until July 1 next, at which time there might be an entire change of conditions in the shipyards of the country, and the colliers would cost more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If there are shipyards willing to do this work at less, does not the gentleman believe the Secretary is unduly alarmed about what will happen in four or five months from now?

Mr. DAWSON. No; I think not.

Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman is on his feet I want to ask him if he will accept an amendment to his amendment carrying an appropriation of money for this particular item, the money to be made immediately available?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no; because that would make my amendment subject to the point of order, and I do not propose to do that.

Mr. DAWSON. I am very much interested to see members of the great Committee on Appropriations put to the test of their sincerity about economy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am putting the test by limiting the cost. Let me ask the gentleman to join me.

Mr. ROBERTS. I want to say a word with regard to the argument made by the gentleman from New York—

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ROBERTS. Of me?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes. The gentleman from Iowa stated a moment ago that this prevents the money being made immediately available.

Mr. ROBERTS. That is a remark of Mr. Dawson, probably.

Mr. MADDEN. I am going to put the question to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I want to know whether, as a matter of fact, the \$3,600,000 appropriated in the succeeding paragraph to the one under consideration was not appropriated last year and is now available?

Mr. ROBERTS. That is the point. It was appropriated last year and it is now available, but has not been all devoted to the purpose. It is not available, however, for the new collier, if that is the purport of the gentleman's question—the collier, the cost of which was sought to be limited by the gentleman's amendment. I want to say just a word about the argument of the gentleman from New York to the effect that private shipbuilders of the country, because we were to build one collier in the navy-yard, came in and made proposals of less than half the cost of the collier in the navy-yard for the purpose of defeating that portion of the congressional action of last year. Let me remind the gentleman that that bill of last year provided for two battle ships, with a limitation of cost for hull and machinery on each of \$6,000,000, one to be built in a navy-yard and one by private contract. My advice is that the contract has been let, or at least awarded, for a battle ship, hull, and machinery for \$4,000,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman know that this is practically the same price that they built a battle ship of 16,000 tons some years ago, a ship of 25 per cent greater displacement, but practically at the same price because of this competition?

Mr. ROBERTS. They are building a bigger battle ship for the same money. Now, why are they doing it? Does the gentleman mean to say that the private shipbuilders are throwing off \$2,000,000 of possible profit on that battle ship for the sake of driving possible ships out of the navy-yard?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been stated they built at a loss to do that.

Mr. ROBERTS. At a price of \$4,000,000, two-thirds of what Congress is willing to pay, that that is done for any such purpose? The fact must be evident to the gentleman and to all the members of this committee who have given the subject any attention that two causes are responsible for the low figures on all classes of government ships here. One is competition among the yards. Never in the history of the country has competition been keener among the private shipyards. Why? Because there is no private work going on in those yards.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because the combination has been broken up.

Mr. ROBERTS. These people have been at great expense collecting a large force of experts in their yards. They are hoping for the time to arrive when they will be busy with private work and will not care a snap of their fingers for government work. In order to tide over and keep their organizations intact until those times arrive they are willing to do work at cost or below, so that their organizations will not be scattered.

I just want, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the gentleman a little further to navy-yard work. In the act of April 27, 1904, we provided for two colliers, the limit of cost being \$1,250,000 each, both colliers to be built in navy-yards, one in a navy-yard on the Atlantic coast and one on the Pacific coast. In the act of June 29, 1906, two years later, the Congress provided that the limit of cost, exclusive of armor and armament, of each of the two colliers authorized by the act of the Congress just mentioned, be increased to \$1,550,000. In two years—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTS (continuing). The department came to Congress and asked for \$300,000 more.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS (continuing). And asked for \$300,000 more—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS (continuing). Then they asked for the original building of those ships.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does not the gentleman know that the department came in and stated that it had completely changed the plans, that it had increased the size and the power of the boats, and they were not the ships for which the appropriation was contemplated at all?

Mr. ROBERTS. I challenge the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The record of the gentleman's committee shows that fact.

Mr. ROBERTS. I challenge that statement. On the first collier we authorized we increased the limit of cost for the reason given by the gentleman, but on the other two we did not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Those were the only two that were authorized.

Mr. ROBERTS. The gentleman is mistaken about these colliers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; I am not.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that we close the debate on this paragraph and the amendment thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], which the Clerk, without objection, will again report.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. FOSS. I hope that will be voted down, Mr. Chairman. I call for a vote.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FOSS. On that I want to make an amendment, if in order, to the effect that the words "to be immediately available" be added.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk proceeded to read, as follows:

After the word "dollars"—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, that is not pending. The pending amendment is to strike out "one million" and insert "nine hundred thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSS] to the fact that his amendment is not an amendment to the one offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FOSS. Will the Clerk read the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 60, line 10, strike out "one million" and insert "nine hundred thousand."

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 67, yeas 14.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to build 4 fleet colliers of 14 knots trial speed when carrying not less than 12,500 tons of cargo and bunker coal in lieu of the 2 fleet colliers having the same characteristics authorized to be built by the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909: *Provided*, That the cost of all 4 colliers shall not exceed the total limit of cost of \$3,600,000 authorized in said act for the 2 colliers: *And provided further*, That all of said colliers, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, may be built by contract.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the proviso to the paragraph, that it changes existing law. I call the attention of the Chair to the last appropriation act, which provides that one of the colliers as authorized shall be built at a navy-yard on the Pacific coast; and this amendment clearly attempts to change existing law.

Mr. FOSS. I call for a ruling of the Chair. I concede that it changes the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the current appropriation law provides that one of these vessels shall be built on the Pacific coast. This changes that provision, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

And the contract for the construction of said vessels shall be awarded by the Secretary of the Navy to the lowest best responsible bidder, hav-

ing in view the best results and most expeditious delivery; and in the construction of all of said vessels the provisions of the act of August 3, 1886, entitled "An act to increase the naval establishment," as to materials for said vessels, their engines, boilers, and machinery, to contracts under which they are built, the notice of any proposal, for the same, the plans, drawings, specifications therefor, and the method of executing said contracts shall be observed and followed, and, subject to the provisions of this act, all said vessels shall be built in compliance with the terms of said act, and in all their parts shall be of domestic manufacture; and the steel material shall be of domestic manufacture and of the quality and characteristics best adapted to the various purposes for which it may be used, in accordance with specifications approved by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I make the point of order on that language, "and in all their parts shall be of domestic manufacture, and the steel material shall be of domestic manufacture," as new legislation and therefore subject to the point of order. There is nowhere in the statutes any law providing that domestic armor shall be used in the construction of vessels or in the armor of vessels. A year ago I made this point of order upon the paragraph providing \$12,000,000 for armor of domestic manufacture, and the Chair at that time, after a hasty examination, overruled my point of order; but in stating his reasons for the decision, as I now read those reasons, it seems to me he failed to give sufficient basis for the decision, and I call it to the attention of the Chair again and ask for a new ruling. At that time the Chair admitted the point that I made to the effect that previous appropriation bills which appropriated for domestic armor did not thereby enact a law permanently establishing domestic armor as the material.

The Chair, however, ruled that Congress had the right to decide what kind of armor should be used and could provide for blue armor or for red armor, or any particular kind of armor. I admit that to be true. I acknowledge that argument to be correct. But this provision does not state the kind of armor to be used. It merely states where the armor shall be manufactured; and if that is not new legislation, then a provision that the armor should be of foreign manufacture would not be new legislation. Stating that the armor shall be domestic is not stating what kind of armor it is, but merely where it is to be made.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, in view of the fact that the armor plate of this country is manufactured practically by one concern only, that competition such as temporarily existed has ceased to be, and in view of the fact that Congress at its extra session, soon to be held, will greatly reduce and possibly entirely abolish the tariff on steel, the Government of the United States, if it is to continue the development of a great navy, should be free to buy its armor in the markets of the world, and a limitation of the sort provided in this appropriation bill, and that has been provided in appropriation bills for the last twenty years, should not be continued. For that reason I have made the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as an additional bit of authority in support of the contention of the gentleman from Nebraska, I call the Chair's attention to the fourth volume of Hinds's Precedents, pages 680 and 681, section 4001, in which I find this:

4001. A paragraph providing that an appropriation should be expended in the United States, an amendment providing for purchase in the world's markets on the best terms was held in order. On January 23, 1906, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when the following paragraph was read:

"THE ISTHMIAN CANAL.

"To continue the construction of the Isthmian Canal, to be expended under the direction of the President in accordance with an act entitled 'An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans,' approved June 28, 1902, as follows:

"For miscellaneous material purchases in the United States, \$1,000,000."

Mr. DAVID A. DE ARMOND offered an amendment to the proposition as to the place of purchase, as follows:

"Amend by adding the following: 'Said purchases shall not be confined to the United States, but the things purchased shall be bought upon the best terms the world's markets afford.'"

Mr. JAMES A. TAWNEY, of Minnesota, made the point of order that the amendment involved legislation.

The Chair having asked if there was any existing law on the subject, and no law being cited, he ruled:

"Unless the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri changes existing law, the Chair will rule the amendment to be in order."

Now, in addition to that, I have had occasion to run down this question, and I have never been able to find any recent legislation compelling armor plate or other similar supplies to be bought in the United States only.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to its ruling last year upon this same subject.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the Chair allow me to read a paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The great author of this book, Hinds's Parliamentary Precedents of the House, says:

A paragraph providing that an appropriation should be expended in the United States, an amendment providing for purchase in the world's markets on the best terms was held in order.

The CHAIRMAN. What decision does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Section 4001, Hinds's Precedents of the House of Representatives, page 680, volume 4. The provision in the bill requires this armor to be of "domestic" manufacture, made in the United States, and this decision seems to cover this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the decision before him. The Chair is prepared to rule. In the paragraph of the bill relating to the construction of the vessels occurs the item:

And in all their parts shall be of domestic manufacture; and the steel material shall be of domestic manufacture.

To that language the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] makes the point of order that it is legislation in an appropriation bill, and hence obnoxious to the rules of the House.

A year ago there was an item in the naval appropriation bill:

Armor and armament: Toward the armor and armament of domestic manufacture for vessels authorized, \$7,000,000.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] made the point of order against the words "of domestic manufacture" on the ground that they were new legislation.

The rulings in reference to items in a naval appropriation bill are somewhat unique, because it has been consistently held for years that without other authorization of Congress by specific legislation it was in order upon the naval appropriation bill to put in items providing for new vessels as carrying on a work or object in progress.

If it is within the power on an appropriation bill to insert the item, it would have the same effect as upon the legislative bill ordinarily of providing a new public building, for instance. In other words, having the authority under the decisions to continue the work of building up the navy as a work or object in progress by inserting in the bill provisions which in ordinary bills would be obnoxious to the rules, the committee has the power to describe the vessel which it is proposed to construct.

Having the power to describe the vessel, the Chair thinks it can say "domestic steel," or "foreign steel," or "red steel," or any other description which it chooses to insert, so long as the ruling prevails that upon this appropriation bill you can describe a work not already authorized by existing law. The Chairman therefore feels compelled, after reexamination, to follow the ruling made by the Chair last year, and accordingly the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before that decision is finally made, I desire to distinguish between the reasoning that the Chair makes as descriptive of the steel and this provision which is not descriptive. Steel of domestic manufacture may be exactly like steel of foreign manufacture, both as to texture, as to strength, as to quality, as to process, and as to ingredients. There is absolutely no attempt made to describe this steel which shall be used in the construction of ships, but the only effort is to set forth where it shall be manufactured.

The CHAIRMAN. And yet it is a matter of description, remaining for the committee to determine whether it be a proper method of describing it or whether it be a desirable method of describing it. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 15, after the word "navy," insert:  
"Provided, Contracts for furnishing the same in a reasonable time, at a reasonable price, and of the required quality can be made with responsible parties."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I offer that amendment because it was originally incorporated in the naval appropriation bill of 1886, creating the new navy, in connection with the provision for steel of domestic manufacture. For some reason in recent naval appropriation bills there has been no limitation whatever upon the requirement that the steel used shall be of domestic manufacture. There has been no latitude whatever left to the Secretary of the Navy and the naval authorities, in case they were being overcharged for domestic steel, to procure the steel in the markets of the world.

Mr. FOSS. If the gentleman will look at page 62, under the head of "Armor and armament," he will find that there is substantially that provision already in the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No, sir; I think that does not cover this provision; and if it does, there can be no objection to incorporating it here.

Mr. FOSS. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For four submarine torpedo boats, in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$2,000,000, and the sum of \$3,000,000 is hereby appropriated toward said purpose and for the completion of submarine boats heretofore authorized: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy may build any or all of the vessels herein authorized in such navy-yards as he may designate, and shall build any of the vessels herein authorized in such navy-yards as he may designate, should it reasonably appear that the persons, firms, or corporations, or the agents thereof, bidding for the construction of any of said vessels have entered into any combination, agreement, or understanding the effect, object, or purpose of which is to deprive the Government of fair, open, and unrestricted competition in letting contracts for the construction of any of said vessels.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the proviso.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 61, line 21, strike out the word "herein" and insert, after the word "authorized," the words "in this act."

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. That is to remove any doubt as to that proviso being applicable to all the vessels authorized in the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and steam machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, \$22,766,823.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 62, after the word "dollars," line 9, insert:  
"Provided, That no part of the appropriation shall be used for the payment or construction of any collier the total cost of which shall exceed \$900,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that that is a change of existing law.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. This is a limitation to conform to the suggestion made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that it is a change of existing law. There are some vessels for which this appropriation is made of the character described upon which greater limit of cost is placed. This is in effect to change the limit of cost on these vessels.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. In reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, I will say that there is no contract entered into by the Navy Department that this will affect. There has been only one contract entered into, and that one is for \$805,000. So this limitation is in no way contrary to any contract.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no use of the gentleman trying to hide his purpose. It is to affect one collier authorized to be built in a government yard, where the materials have been contracted for and the limit of cost of which is in excess of \$900,000.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Does the gentleman say that that is the intention of the gentleman from New Jersey? It affects all colliers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman ought to have thought of that when he reported the bill from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The item in the bill is on account of hulls and outfits of vessels and steam machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, \$22,766,823, to which the gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment providing that no part of the above appropriation shall be used for the payment or construction of any collier, the total cost of which shall exceed \$900,000. It is quite within the province of the committee or of Congress to appropriate or not to appropriate for colliers heretofore authorized, or to provide that they will not appropriate except under certain limitations. The amendment is a pure limitation on the appropriation carried in the bill, and the Chair therefore overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 63, noes 7.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Armor and armament: Toward the armor and armament of domestic manufacture for vessels authorized, \$12,452,772: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for armor for vessels except upon contracts for such armor when awarded by the Secretary of the Navy to the lowest responsible bidders, having in view the best results and most expeditious delivery.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 62, line 17, after the word "delivery," insert: "*Provided also*, That contracts for furnishing said armor in a reasonable time at a reasonable price and of the required quality can be made with responsible parties."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. Chairman, that was the same amendment which was accepted in regard to steel in the vessels proper, and I suppose it will be acceptable to the chairman.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 16, page 62, insert between the words "responsible" and "bidders" the words "domestic or foreign," so that it will read "to the lowest responsible domestic or foreign bidder."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 62, line 16, after the word "responsible," insert the words "domestic or foreign," so it will read "to the lowest domestic or foreign bidder."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, a very serious matter in the commercial world has occurred since we discussed this matter last year. All gentlemen know that the Steel trust, in short, has gobbled up its one competitor on American soil, and yet we come along here and make no effort to try to counteract that monopolistic act. I call that to the attention of the committee. The committee must know that it is an undisputed fact that the Steel trust has not a competitor on American soil, and that armor is purely and simply nothing but steel of the highest quality. You know that foreign countries make armor. You have promised tariff reform, though I shall not discuss that for an instant. Here you make a law to apply for another year, and this amendment covers pure steel armor. You are discussing whether or not you will put steel entirely on the free list, and one or two great authorities, I believe, have said it should be done, because the price of steel in foreign countries would be about equivalent of that in this country even if we had free trade in steel. The effect of this proposition is to give the department the power to accept a foreign bid if it is as responsible and as good as our own home bids. It is a business proposition. Conditions have seriously changed, and the matter is up to the House to see what they will do now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GAINES of Tennessee) there were—ayes 50, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the amendment already adopted, after line 17, on page 62, insert: "*Provided*, That the purchases of armor plate shall not be confined to the United States, but may be purchased upon the best terms that the world's markets offer."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LOUDENSLAGER and Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 55, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Increase of the navy; torpedo boats: On account of submarine torpedo boats, heretofore and herein authorized, \$3,000,000.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 21, 22, and 23, page 62—the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk then concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the totals in different parts of the bill so as to conform to the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the totals may be corrected by the Clerk, so that they will conform with the rest of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to return to page 13 for the purpose of considering the amendment still pending on that page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered on page 13.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 13, after line 4, the following amendment:

"For badges and ribbons to be distributed by the Secretary of the Navy to officers and men now or formerly of the Volunteer and Regular Navy and Marine Corps who have participated in engagements and campaigns deemed worthy of such commemoration, \$2,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that I have no objection to the amendment, in fact, that I agree to it.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 26394, the navy appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to its final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote asked on any amendment? If not, the amendments will be voted upon in gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill is passed. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an inquiry. Did the Chair ever put the motion whether the bill should pass or not?

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated deliberately, and waited for objection, that without objection, the bill would be considered as passed.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I want to add an objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia desires to object?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I do.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman seek to object at the time?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I did not understand what the Speaker said. I made inquiry with reference to it.

The SPEAKER. It seems to the Chair that the gentleman from Georgia was paying attention and did not hear, and that in fairness to the gentleman and to the House that the vote should be taken upon the bill.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANDLER. Can a bill be passed simply by the Chair stating that, "without objection, the bill will be considered as passed?"

The SPEAKER. It has been done constantly. Anything can be done by the House by unanimous consent. If it were practically possible to get an elephant in the door, the elephant could be passed through the House. [Laughter.] The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion by Mr. Foss, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

## SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8265. An act to regulate examinations for promotion in the Medical Corps of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## Senate concurrent resolution 75.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made and submit estimates for the following improvements in the Mattaponi River, Virginia:

For a channel 100 feet wide and 7 feet deep from the above-mentioned landing to Ayletts;

For a channel 60 feet wide and 5 feet deep from Ayletts to Dunkirk;

For a channel 7 feet deep across the Middle Ground connecting the Mattaponi and Pamunkey channels just off West Point;

For a suitable turning basin at Ayletts;

For the straightening and cutting off certain bends and points of land projecting into the river at several points between Walkerton and Ayletts; and

For a thorough snagging and removal of logs from the river between Walkerton and Dunkirk, and the clearing of the river banks of all trees, stumps, etc., which make navigation dangerous at times of extra high tides or freshets in the river—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## Senate concurrent resolution 74.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of Rye Harbor, in the State of New Hampshire, with a view to restoring navigation therein, and to submit estimates for the same—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## Senate concurrent resolution 73.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made of the Columbia River between Wenatchee and the mouth of the Snake River, in the State of Washington, with a view to making such improvements as may be deemed necessary in order to provide for navigation between the upper and lower river—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## Senate concurrent resolution 72.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made of the Swinomish Slough, Washington, with a view to such extensions and modifications of the project for the improvement of the same as may be necessary in the interests of navigation—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## Senate concurrent resolution 71.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey and estimate to be made of the Samamish River, Washington, with a view to clearing and restoring said river to navigation—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## Senate concurrent resolution 70.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be made an examination and survey of East Boothbay Harbor, Maine, with a view to extending the improvement contemplated in the report submitted in House Document No. 944, Sixtieth Congress, first session, to Hodgdon's wharf—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## Senate concurrent resolution 69.

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be made an examination and survey of the Jetties and channel of Sabine Pass, in the State of Texas, from the 30-foot contour beyond the bar at the entrance to said Sabine Pass to and including the turning basin at Port Arthur, with a view to widening the channel and the Port Arthur Ship Canal to 200 feet at bottom and increasing the depth thereof and of the turning basin to 30 feet at mean low tide, together with the extension of the walls of the existing jetties to the 30-foot contour, and to submit estimates for such improvements.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, also authorized and directed to cause to be made an examination and survey of Taylors Bayou and the lumber slip adjacent thereto, with the view of removing the narrow strip of land separating Taylors Bayou and lumber slip and the deepening of said Taylors Bayou and lumber slip for a length of 2,500 feet to a depth of 30 feet.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be made an examination and survey of the Neches River from Beaumont to its mouth, and of the Sabine River from Orange to its mouth, and the canal extending from the mouths of the Sabine and Neches rivers to mouth of Taylors Bayou, with a view to widening and deepening said canal to a width of 200 feet at the bottom of said canal and increasing the depth thereof to 30 feet, and with a further view of removing the obstructions in the said rivers and improving the same to a depth of 30 feet—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. R. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to establish harbor lines in the Kansas River at Kansas City, Mo.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions and bill of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution to enable the States of Mississippi and Arkansas to agree upon a boundary line and to determine the jurisdiction of crimes committed on the Mississippi River and adjacent territory;

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution to enable the States of Mississippi and Louisiana to agree upon a boundary line and to determine the jurisdiction of crimes committed on the Mississippi River and adjacent territory; and

H. R. 15098. An act to correct the military record of John H. Layne.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 6665. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dickson; and

S. 653. An act to authorize commissions to issue in the cases of officers of the army, navy, and Marine Corps, and of the Revenue-Cutter Service, retired with increased rank.

## NATURAL RESOURCES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States, which was read.

[For message see Senate proceedings of this day.]

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves the reference of the message to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and that the same be printed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Military Academy buildings and grounds (H. Doc. No. 1359)—to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 1360)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 1361)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the president of the Civil Service Commission submitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 1362)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 106) authorizing the granting of permits to the committee on inaugural ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect on March 4, 1909, and so forth, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1896), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 227) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver a condemned cannon to the Grand Army of the Republic, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1900), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2024) to amend an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to grant to the Veteran Volunteer Firemen's Association use of certain property in the city of Washington, ap-

proved March 2, 1891, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1903), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24336) to amend section 3613 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1898), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 24337) to amend section 2625 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1899), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26606) to authorize the Lewis Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Missouri River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1901), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26734) to permit change of entry in case of mistake of the description of tracts intended to be entered, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1902), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21560) to provide for circuit and district courts of the United States at Gadsden, Ala., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1907), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KAHN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23707) to incorporate the Imperial Palace Dramatic Order Knights of Khorassan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1908), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KELIHER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23973) for the relief of pensioners of the Metropolitan police fund, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1909), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCGAVIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 489) requesting certain information from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia relative to the enforcement of a law requiring the erection of fire escapes on certain buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1910), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2911) for the relief of the Columbus Gas and Fuel Company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1904), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3748) for the relief of the Logan Natural Gas and Fuel Company, of Columbus, Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1905), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1622) for the relief of the estate of William J. Cussen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1906), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 24432) granting an increase of pension to

Frank E. Moore—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 26871) to pay Harrison Wagner the sum of \$231.99—Committee on Accounts discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 26917) to make it unlawful for certain public officials to own capital stock or bonds in any and all public-service corporations doing business in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 26918) extending the provisions of an act approved February 6, 1901, entitled "An act amending the act of August 15, 1894, entitled 'An act making appropriations for current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and fulfilling treaties and stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes,'" to any person claiming any right in the common property of the Choctaw or Chickasaw Indians or tribes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 26919) authorizing the Attorney-General to appoint as special peace officers such employees of the Alaska school service as may be named by the Secretary of the Interior—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 26920) to repeal section 12 of an act entitled "An act to provide for a union railroad station in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1903, and to provide for the location and erection of a substation on the parking at the corner formed by the intersection of the east side of Seventh street and the south side of C street SW., in the city of Washington, D. C., by the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Company, and to provide for the approval of the same by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 26921) granting pensions to all enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the civil war and war with Mexico—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 26922) to confer additional powers and impose additional duties on the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 26923) to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States or with the United States for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 503) directing the Committee on the Judiciary to report certain information to the House relative to collection of taxes under the income-tax law of 1861—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEISSE: Resolution (H. Res. 504) directing the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to compile certain statistics for the information of the House—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JACKSON: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 58) directing the Secretary of War to make a survey of Pocomoke River in Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 59) directing the Secretary of War to make a survey of the Wicomico River in Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 60) directing the Secretary of War to cause a survey to be made of the Choptank River in Maryland—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRONNA: Memorial of the legislature of North Dakota, urging the passage of the bill H. R. 21848—to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 26924) for the relief of John A. Brown—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 26925) granting a pension to Ralph C. Lund—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 26926) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Kistner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26927) granting an increase of pension to Martin G. Paxton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26928) granting a pension to Daniel L. Goodwin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 26929) granting an increase of pension to John Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26930) granting an increase of pension to Peter Selner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 26931) granting an increase of pension to John H. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 26932) granting an increase of pension to Sidney B. McDonald—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 26933) granting an increase of pension to Sophia A. Underwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER: A bill (H. R. 26934) granting a pension to J. M. O'Rourke—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALE: A bill (H. R. 26935) granting an increase of pension to Jay D. Howard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26936) granting an increase of pension to Sear S. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26937) granting an increase of pension to George H. Daubner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 26938) granting an increase of pension to David S. Hurst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 26939) granting an increase of pension to Anthony Ciesulskie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 26940) for the relief of W. T. Lemaster and James M. Stout—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 26941) granting a pension to Mattie J. Hovey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26942) granting an increase of pension to J. N. Kirk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 26943) granting an increase of pension to James D. Barnes—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 26944) granting a pension to Abigail A. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 26945) granting a pension to Movintha Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26946) granting a pension to Marion S. Day—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 26947) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26948) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 26949) granting a pension to Hezikiah Sloan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KÜSTERMANN: A bill (H. R. 26950) granting an increase of pension to Robert Spice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 26951) granting a pension to Addie Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 26952) granting a pension to Isaac Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26953) granting a pension to Harriet Maupin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26954) granting an increase of pension to Turner Branham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 26955) granting an increase of pension to John Whitaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 26956) granting an increase of pension to William O. Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26957) granting an increase of pension to George Urban—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOWDEN: A bill (H. R. 26958) granting an increase

of pension to John S. Norris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAYNARD: A bill (H. R. 26959) for the relief of Elise Trigg Shields—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 26960) granting an increase of pension to Francis Fuller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 26961) granting a pension to Hannah Turner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26962) granting a pension to Barbara Bauman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26963) granting an increase of pension to William G. Shute—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 26964) granting an increase of pension to Adolph Frey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PORTER: A bill (H. R. 26965) granting an increase of pension to John R. Barlow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 26966) granting an increase of pension to Orley B. Giffin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26967) granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Jeffries—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 26968) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sarah D. Bookout, late of Jackson County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 26969) granting a pension to Sarah A. Salter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 26970) granting an increase of pension to David Farquhar—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 26971) for the relief of Capt. Joseph M. Johnson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWASEY: A bill (H. R. 26972) granting a pension to Luella F. Sessions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 26973) granting an increase of pension to Eliab Averill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 26974) for the relief of John Wise—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WALDO: A bill (H. R. 26975) to pay certain claims against the Government arising under the Navy Department—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASHBURN: A bill (H. R. 26976) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Clement Lamoureux—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 26977) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 26978) for the relief of the State of Georgia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 26979) granting an increase of pension to Walter S. Parsons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIGGINS: A bill (H. R. 26980) to correct the military record of L. F. Norton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIMBALL: A bill (H. R. 26981) for the relief of the estate of James O. Harrison, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 26982) granting a pension to Horace B. Case—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 26983) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Nonnamaker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the San Francisco Labor Council and the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, and the Wilmington (Del.) Central Labor Union, protesting against the action of the supreme court of the District of Columbia in sentencing Messrs. Gompers, Mitchell, and Morrison to jail—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against legislation which would tend to embarrass the railroads in their normal development—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Maine Prison Association, praying for a suitable provision to assist in holding the National Prison Congress in Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the American Chemical Society, praying for the establishment of a permanent commission to investigate chemical subjects relating to the conservation of the natural resources of the country, and to make reports to Congress and the States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Frank Wilcox and 36 others, of Saranac Lake, N. Y.; of Orlando Winch and 18 others, of Keene, N. Y.; of S. B. Oberholtzer and 7 others, of Stanton, Mich., protesting against the passage of the bill (S. 3940) relating to the proper observance of Sunday in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the National Business League of America, praying for the enactment of legislation favoring the acquisition in foreign countries of sites and buildings for use of the diplomatic and foreign service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the A. Karcher Candy Company, of Little Rock, Ark., and other firms and individuals in the United States, praying for the reduction of the duty on sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Company and other shipbuilding firms in the United States, praying for legislation to provide for transportation by sea of material for use in the construction of the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Association of Masters, Mates, and Pilots, of Rondout, N. Y.; Portsmouth, N. H.; Boston, Mass.; New Orleans, La., and Camden, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "Hayes bill" (H. R. 15657)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of O. W. Hall and 2 others, of St. Louis, Mo.; Frank O. Ware and 18 others, of Deerfield Grange, New Jersey, and Nina Calkins and 20 others, praying for the establishment of a parcels-post and a postal savings banks system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of General Association of the Congregational Churches in Minnesota, favoring legislation to prevent Sunday banking in post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of state school of agriculture, of Morrisville, N. Y., praying for legislation to provide additional farm labor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the National Negro Fair Association, praying for national assistance in aid of the National Negro Exposition near the city of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of John F. Ward Lodge, A. A. of F. S. and T. M., No. 9, of New Castle, Pa., favoring retention of present duty on tin plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pittsburg Coal Exchange, for a river and harbor bill for second session of the Sixtieth Congress—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring increase of salaries of United States judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fairview Grange, of Hicksville, Ohio, favoring a parcels-post and postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Buffalo Candy Company, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Fairview Grange, of Hicksville, Defiance County, Ohio, favoring a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Fairview Grange, of Hicksville, Ohio, favoring a parcels-post and postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BATES: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John H. French—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Martin K. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of W. J. Wertman and others, favoring parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition of Thomas P. Campbell, against increase of salary of the President—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Commercial Exchange, of Philadelphia, against federal inspection of grain—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Board of Trade, against S. 382, relative to federal inspection and grading of grain—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Headquarters Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, against consolidation of pension agencies at Washington (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Somerset County, Me., against the passage of S. 3940 (proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of the Friends of Chester County, Pa., against conferring power on the Secretary of the Interior or any other officer to issue patent in fee simple to any Indian allottee for punishment for being addicted to the use of strong drink—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of state school of agriculture at Morrisville, N. Y., favoring enlargement of bureau of authority for supply of adequate intelligent farm labor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Print Cutters' Association, favoring an advance of the duty on print blocks and rollers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William A. Walker, jr., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHANEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John B. Sheridan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of Board of Trade of Apalachicola, Fla., asking for adequate protection and improvement of the mouth of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COOK: Petition of Courtland Saunders Post, Grand Army of the Republic, against abolition of pension agencies (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRAVENS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William S. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of National Board of Trade, against federal inspection and grading of grain—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Petition of Gardiner (N. Y.) Grange, No. 965, for a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions adopted at Grand Army encampment, opposing consolidation of pension agencies—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Bar Association of New York, favoring increase of salaries to judges of federal courts—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of trustees state school of agriculture, of New York, favoring competent farm labor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Business League of America, favoring the acquisition of sites for embassies in foreign countries—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: Petition of Illinois State Horticultural Society, favoring S. 6515 and H. R. 21318 as amended at the conference of entomologists held in New York City June 18, 1908—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of citizens of Idaho, for increase of salaries of United States judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of National Board of Trade, against federal grading and inspection of grain (S. 382)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of Amesbury Grange, No. 127, of Amesbury, Mass., favoring establishment of parcels-post and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petitions of National Board of Trade and the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, against federal inspection of grain—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Headquarters Grand Army of the Republic, Philadelphia, against consolidation of pension agencies at Washington (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Lumbermen's Club, against reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring increase of salaries of United States judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of John Lucas & Co., of Philadelphia, and J. Howard Reber, favoring increase of salaries of United States judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Grain, Pump, and Lumber Company, favor-

ing S. 6973 (increasing salaries of United States judges)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE: Petition of A. C. Goddard and others, against further enlargement of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Petition of bar association of New York City, favoring H. R. 23464, increasing salaries of the Chief Justice and associate justices—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Farmingdale Grange, No. 157, of Farmingdale, N. J., against parcels-post and postal savings banks laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Headquarters Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, against consolidation of pension agencies at Washington (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, for increase of judges' salaries—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Board of Trade, against S. 382, providing for federal inspection of grain—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lumbermen's Club of Memphis, Tenn., against reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of citizens of Iowa, against S. 3940 (religious legislation in the District of Columbia)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of Daniel Denehy and 95 other residents of Crockett, and J. A. Gondie and 95 other residents of San Pedro, all in the State of California, favoring an Asiatic exclusion law against all Asiatics other than merchants, travelers, and students—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELIHER: Petition of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring legislation for control of national reservations in White Mountain and Appalachian districts—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: Petition of citizens of Contra Costa County, Cal., against passage of the Johnston Sunday-rest bill (S. 3940)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of National Board of Trade, against federal inspection and grading of grain (S. 382)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lumbermen's Club, against reduction of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVERING: Petition of Ernest D. Gilman and others, for a national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. A. Loud and others, favoring a parcels-post and postal savings banks law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MALBY: Petition of Scotch Bush Grange, No. 699, and Chateaugay Grange, No. 964, favoring creation of national highway commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Adolph Frey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Huron Grange, No. 124, and Farmington Grange, No. 431, favoring parcels post on rural free-delivery routes and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of citizens of Texas, favoring the placing of art works on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth T. Hardeman (H. R. 24279)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS: Petition of Boston Society of Architects, against the bill appropriating \$5,000,000 for a Lincoln memorial—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Boston Society of Architects, favoring President's plan for the establishment of a national council of fine arts—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring legislation to establish a national forest reservation in the White Mountains and Appalachian districts—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring increase of salaries of United States judges—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Board of Trade, against federal inspection and grading of grain (S. 382)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of state school of agriculture, of

Morrisville, N. Y., for enlarged powers of Department of Agriculture to supply intelligent farm labor—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture into the use and substitution of raw cotton for other materials of manufacture and report thereon—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Board of Trade, against federal inspection and grading of grain—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of business men of Paris and Henry County, Tenn., for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the women's clubs of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the Beveridge child-labor bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SWASEY: Petitions of citizens of West Peru, Turner, and Livermore, Me., favoring enactment of a law creating a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of citizens of Oxford and Rumford, Me., favoring parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of heirs of John B. Wolf, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Michigan state legislature, favoring a civil war Union volunteer officers' retired list (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHBURN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Clement Lamoureux—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Trades League of Philadelphia, favoring increase of salaries of United States judges (S. 6973)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of National Board of Trade, against federal inspection and grading of grain (S. 382)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Gertrude E. Snook (H. R. 26821)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James V. D. Ten Eyck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 23, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BRICK.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the following order, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Order No. 19.

Ordered, That there be a session of the House at 3 p. m., Sunday, February 14, for the delivery of eulogies on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. ABRAHAM LINCOLN BRICK, late a Member of this House from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the order is agreed to.

### SECTIONS 3646 AND 3647, REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill, H. R. 25805:

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 25805) to reenact and to amend sections 3646 and 3647 of the Revised Statutes.

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 3646 and 3647 of the Revised Statutes be, and they hereby are, reenacted and amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3646. Whenever any original disbursing officer's check is lost, stolen or destroyed the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize the officer issuing the same, after the expiration of six months and within three years from the date of such disbursing officer's check, to issue a duplicate thereof upon the execution of such bond to indemnify the United States as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That when such original disbursing officer's check does not exceed in amount the sum of \$50 the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize the issuance of a duplicate at any time after the expiration of thirty days and within three years from the date of such disbursing officer's check: *Provided further*, That whenever any original check or